arXiv:1403.2141v3 [math.NA] 4 Jun 2015

# Convergence of the Point Integral method for the Poisson equation on manifolds I: the Neumann Boundary

Zuoqiang Shi* Jian Sun †

June 5, 2015

**Abstract**

The partial differential equations on manifolds arise in many applications. The Poisson equation on manifolds plays an important role in both mathematics and many applied fields. Recently, we have proposed a novel numerical method which we call the point integral method (PIM) to solve the Poisson equation from point clouds. The basic idea of the PIM is to approximate the Poisson equation using an integral equation which can be easily discretized from point clouds. In this paper, we prove the convergence of the PIM for solving the Poisson equation with the Neumann boundary.

## 1 Introduction

The partial differential equations on manifolds arise in a wide variety of applications. In recent years, it has attracted many attentions to develop efficient numerical methods for solving PDEs on manifolds. It is very challenging due to the complicated geometrical structure of manifolds. Among various PDEs, the Laplace-Beltrami operator (the Poisson equation) plays one of the most important roles. The Laplace-Beltrami operator (LBO) is a fundamental object associated to Riemannian manifolds, which encodes all intrinsic geometry of manifolds and has many desirable properties. It is also related to diffusion and heat equation on manifold, and is connected to a large body of physical and mathematical problems (see, e.g., [34]). In recent years, the Laplace-Beltrami operator has also attracted much attention in many applied fields, including material science [11, 20], fluid flow [23, 25], biology and biophysics [3, 21, 32, 2], and computer science [4, 14].

In this paper, we consider the Poisson equation on a smooth, compact $k$-dimensional submanifold $\mathcal{M}$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq k$ with the Neumann boundary

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathcal{M}} u(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x}), & \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M} \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{x}) = b(\mathbf{x}), & \mathbf{x} \in \partial\mathcal{M} \end{cases} \tag{N1}$$

where $\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}$ is the Laplace-Beltrami operator on $\mathcal{M}$. Let $g$ be the Riemannian metric tensor of $\mathcal{M}$. Given a local coordinate system $(x^1, x^2, \cdots, x^k)$, the metric tensor $g$ can be represented by a matrix $[g_{ij}]_{k\times k}$,

$$g_{ij} = < \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} >, \quad i, j = 1, \cdots, k. \tag{1.1}$$

Let $[g^{ij}]_{k\times k}$ is the inverse matrix of $[g_{ij}]_{k\times k}$, then it is well known that the Laplace-Beltrami operator is

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{M}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det g}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} (g^{ij} \sqrt{\det g} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}) \tag{1.2}$$

*Mathematical Sciences Center, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China, 100084. *Email: zqshi@math.tsinghua.edu.cn.*
†Mathematical Sciences Center, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China, 100084. *Email: jsun@math.tsinghua.edu.cn.*

In this paper, the metric tensor $g$ is assumed to be inherited from the ambient space $\mathbb{R}^d$, that is, $\mathcal{M}$ isometrically embedded in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with the standard Euclidean metric. If $\mathcal{M}$ is an open set in $\mathbb{R}^d$, then $\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}$ becomes standard Laplace operator, i.e., $\Delta_{\mathcal{M}} = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^{i\,2}}$. It is known that the solution of the Neumann problem (N1) is not unique. To fix the solution, we require that the average of the solution to be 0, i.e. the solution of (N1) satisfies that $\int_{\mathcal{M}} u(\mathbf{x}) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} = 0$.

The finite element method (FEM) is widely used in solving PDEs numerically. It can be applied to solve PDEs on manifolds provided global meshes tessellating manifolds are available. It is proven to have many good properties like fast convergence rate. However, the performance of FEM depends heavily on the quality of meshes. A mesh with bad shaped elements may increase the condition number of the involved linear systems and hence reduce the accuracy of FEM [35]. It is not an easy task to generate a mesh of good quality, especially for an irregular domain [12], and becomes much more difficult for a curved submanifold [10]. In fact, in FEM, more than half of the resources are used for mesh generation, as it often requires human interference.

In [29], we have proposed a numerical method called the point integral method (PIM), to solve the Poisson equation on manifolds. The main ingredient of this method is to approximate the LBO $\Delta_{\mathcal{M}} u(\mathbf{x})$ using the following linear operator which we call the integral Laplace operator

$$L_t u(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{t} \int_{\mathcal{M}} R_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})(u(\mathbf{x}) - u(\mathbf{y})) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}, \tag{1.3}$$

and the Poisson equation using the following integral equation

$$-L_t u(\mathbf{x}) + 2 \int_{\partial \mathcal{M}} \bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) b(\mathbf{y}) \mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{y}} = \int_{\mathcal{M}} \bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) f(\mathbf{y}) d\mu_{\mathbf{y}}, \tag{N2}$$

where $R_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ and $\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ are kernel functions defined in (2.1) and (2.2), and $\mathbf{n}$ is the outward normal along $\partial\mathcal{M}$. The main advantage of this integral equation is that there is no differential operators in the equation. It is easy to be discretized from point clouds using numerical integration. The integral equation (N2) actually builds a bridge between the Poisson equation on manifolds and its discretization on point clouds. As a meshless method, the PIM avoids the process of meshing the underlying domain, which can be very difficult for curved submanifolds. Therefore it has the advantages against the traditional finite element method, especially when meshes of good quality are not available, which indeed occurs in many applications.

The main contribution of this paper is that we prove that the numerical solution computed by the PIM converges to the exact solution in $H^1$ norm as the density of the sample points tends to infinity. It is well known in the numerical analysis that the convergence is implied by the consistency and the stability. We will show that the PIM is consistent (Theorem 4.1 and 4.2) and stable (Theorem 4.3 and 4.6). In proving the stability of the PIM, we show that the integral Laplace operator $L_t$ preserves the coercivity of the Laplace-Beltrami operator (see Theorem 4.4 and 4.5), which is interesting on its own.

As an application of the results in this paper, we are able to show that the spectra of the graph Laplacian with a proper normalization converge to the spectra of $\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}$ with the Neumann boundary condition. Moreover, we obtain an estimate of the rate of the spectral convergence. In [29], using the Robin boundary which bridges the Neumann boundary and the Dirichlet boundary, the point integral method is able to solve the Poisson equation with the Dirichlet boundary. Applying the estimates obtained in this paper, we can also show the convergence of the PIM for the Dirichlet boundary. Due to the space limitation, these results will be reported in our subsequent papers.

## 1.1 Related work

The finite element method is popular in solving PDEs on manifolds. Dziuk [18] showed FEM converges quadratically in $L^2$ norm and linearly in $H^1$ norm for solving the Poisson equations. Recently, Wardetzky [39] showed the same convergence rate holds even with approximating sequences of meshes. The eigensystem of Laplace-Beltrami operator also converges for FEM linearly [38, 16, 39]. Boffi [9] showed the convergence

of FEM for general compact operators. In recent years, many efforts were devoted to develop alternative numerical methods to avoid generating global meshes as it is difficult to obtain global meshes for curved manifolds. Liang and Zhao [30] and Lai et al. [27] also consider the problem of solving PDEs on submanifolds from point clouds. They approximate submanifolds and differential operators from point clouds by local least squares or local meshes. In their methods, the discretization is locally constructed and thus requires no global meshes. In many problems, their methods are very efficient. However, they suffer from the non-consistency between different local patches, which makes it difficult to do theoretical analysis. For the special but important case of PDEs on two-dimensional surfaces embedded in $\mathbb{R}^3$, many other methods were proposed including level set methods [1, 40], surface finite elements [19], finite volume methods [28], diffuse interface methods [22].

The graph Laplacian is a discrete object associated to a graph, which reveals many properties of graphs as does the Laplace-Beltrami operator to manifolds [13]. It is observed in [5, 26, 24, 36] that the graph Laplacian with the Gaussian weights well approximates the LBO when the vertices of the graph are assumed to sample the underlying manifold. When there is no boundary, Belkin and Niyogi [6] showed the spectra of the graph Laplacian with Gaussian weights converges to that of $\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}$. The main issue that remains is how to deal with the boundary. In fact, near the boundary, it was observed [26, 7] that the graph Laplacian is dominated by the first order derivative and thus fails to be true Laplacian. Recently, Singer and Wu [37] showed the spectral convergence of the graph Laplacian in the presence of the Neumann boundary. In both [6] and [37], the convergence analysis is based on the connection between the graph Laplacian and the heat operator, and thus the Gaussian weights are essential.

Another related work is the nonlocal diffusion problem studied by Du et al [17] and many others where the nonlocal operator takes the same form as the integral Laplace operator.

**Organization of the paper.** The remaining of this paper is organized as following. In Section 2, we describe the point integral method. The main results are stated in Section 3. The structure of the proof is shown in Section 4. We discuss the future work in Section 5. In section 6, we show several basic estimates related to the properties of smooth submanifolds and the convolutions with the kernel $R$. The main body of the proof is in Section 7, Section 8, Section 9 and Section 10.

## 2 Point Integral Method

To numerically solve the problems (N1), assume we are given a set of sample points $P$ sampling the submanifold $\mathcal{M}$ and a subset $S \subset P$ sampling the boundary of $\mathcal{M}$. List the points in $P$ respectively $S$ in a fixed order $P = (\mathbf{p}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{p}_n)$ where $\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d, 1 \le i \le n$, respectively $S = (\mathbf{s}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{s}_m)$ where $\mathbf{s}_i \in P$.

In addition, assume we are given two vectors $\mathbf{V} = (V_1, \cdots, V_n)^t$ where $V_i$ is an volume weight of $\mathbf{p}_i$ in $\mathcal{M}$, and $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \cdots, A_m)^t$ where $A_i$ is an area weight of $\mathbf{s}_i$ in $\partial\mathcal{M}$, so that for any Lipschitz function $f$ on $\mathcal{M}$ respectively $\partial\mathcal{M}$, $\int_{\mathcal{M}} f(\mathbf{x}) d\mu_{\mathbf{x}}$ respectively $\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} f(\mathbf{x}) d\tau_{\mathbf{x}}$ can be approximated by $\sum_{i=1}^n f(\mathbf{p}_i) V_i$ respectively $\sum_{i=1}^m f(\mathbf{s}_i) A_i$. Here $d\mu_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $d\tau_{\mathbf{x}}$ are the volume form of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\partial\mathcal{M}$, respectively.

Finally, the function $f$ and the function $b$ in the problem (N1) are specified by their evaluation at the sample points. Specifically, $f$ respectively $b$ is given as the vector $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \cdots, f_n)^t$ with $f_i = f(\mathbf{p}_i)$ respectively $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \cdots, b_m)^t$ with $b_i = b(\mathbf{s}_i)$. We are ready to describe the point integral method for solving the problem (N1). Let $R : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ to be a positive $C^2$ function which is integrable over $[0, +\infty)$. Given a parameter $t > 0$, for any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, denote

$$R_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = C_t R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right) \tag{2.1}$$

where $C_t = \frac{1}{(4\pi t)^{k/2}}$ is the normalizing factor. The function $R_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ serves as the integral kernel. Let

$$\bar{R}(r) = \int_r^{+\infty} R(s)\mathrm{d}s, \quad \text{and } \bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = C_t \bar{R}\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right) \tag{2.2}$$

Then $\frac{\partial \bar{R}}{\partial r} = -R$. When $R(r) = e^{-r}$, $\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = R_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = C_t \exp\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right)$ are the well-known Gaussian.

The key step in PIM is to approximate the Neumann problem (N1) by the integral equation (N2) with small $t$, which is then discretized using the point cloud data $(P, S, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{A})$ to obtain the following linear system of $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \cdots, u_n)^t$. Let

$$\mathcal{L}\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{p}_i) = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{\mathbf{p}_j \in P} R_t(\mathbf{p}_i, \mathbf{p}_j)(u_i - u_j)V_j \tag{2.3}$$

be the discrete Laplace operator, which becomes the weighted graph Laplacian if set $V_j = \frac{1}{n}$ (e.g. [5]). We have for any $1 \le i \le n$

$$-\mathcal{L}\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{p}_i) = -2 \sum_{\mathbf{s}_j \in S} \bar{R}_t(\mathbf{p}_i, \mathbf{s}_j) b_j A_j + \sum_{\mathbf{p}_j \in P} \bar{R}_t(\mathbf{p}_i, \mathbf{p}_j) f_j V_j. \tag{N3}$$

We use the solution $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \cdots, u_n)^t$ to the above linear system to approximate the solution to the problem (N1).

# 3 Main Results

Our main theoretical contribution is to establish the convergence results for the Point Integral method for solving the problem (N1). To simplify the notation and make the proof concise, in the theoretical part, we only consider the homogeneous boundary conditions, i.e. $b = 0$ in (N1). The analysis can be easily generalized to the non-homogeneous boundary conditions.

## 3.1 Assumptions

To state the convergence result, we need to impose some assumptions on the regularity of the submanifold $\mathcal{M}$, the integral kernel $R$, and the input point cloud.

**Assumption 3.1.**

- Assumptions on the manifold: $\mathcal{M}, \partial\mathcal{M}$ are both compact and $C^\infty$ smooth submanifolds isometrically embedded in a Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^d$.
- Assumptions on the input data $(P, S, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{A})$: $(P, S, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{A})$ is an $h$-integrable approximation of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\partial\mathcal{M}$, i.e.
  (a) For any function $f \in C^1(\mathcal{M})$, there is a constant $C$ independent of $h$ and $f$ so that
  $$\left| \int_{\mathcal{M}} f(\mathbf{y}) \mathrm{d}\mathbf{y} - \sum_{\mathbf{p}_i \in P} f(\mathbf{p}_i) V_i \right| < Ch|\mathrm{supp}(f)| \|f\|_{C^1(\mathcal{M})}.$$
  where $\|f\|_{C^1} = \|f\|_\infty + \|\nabla f\|_\infty$ and $|\mathrm{supp}(f)|$ is the volume of the support of $f$.
  (b) For any function $f \in \partial\mathcal{M}$, there is a constant $C$ independent of $h$ and $f$ so that
  $$\left| \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} f(\mathbf{y}) d\tau_{\mathbf{y}} - \sum_{\mathbf{s}_i \in S} f(\mathbf{s}_i) A_i \right| < Ch|\mathrm{supp}(f)| \|f\|_{C^1}.$$
- Assumptions on the kernel function $R(r)$:
  (a) $R \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^+)$;
  (b) $R(r) \ge 0$ and $R(r) = 0$ for $\forall r > 1$;
  (c) $\exists \delta_0 > 0$ so that $R(r) \ge \delta_0$ for $0 \le r \le \frac{1}{2}$.

**Remark 3.1.** It is for the sake of simplicity that $R$ is assumed to be compactly supported. After some mild modifications of the proof, the same convergence results also hold for any integral kernel that decays exponentially, like the Gaussian kernel $G_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) = C_t \exp\left(-\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right)$. In fact, for any $s \geq 1$ and any $\epsilon > 0$, the $H^s$ mass of the Gaussian kernel over the domain $\Omega = \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{M} || \mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2 \geq t^{1+\epsilon}\}$ decays faster than any polynomial in $t$ as $t$ goes to 0, i.e., $\lim_{t\to 0} \frac{\|G_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\|_{H^s(\Omega)}}{t^\alpha} = 0$ for any $\alpha$. In this way, we can bound any influence of the integral outside a compact support.

**Remark 3.2.** It is much easier to obtain the input data $(P, S, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{A})$ which is an $h$-integral approximation of $(\mathcal{M}, \partial\mathcal{M})$ than to generate a consistent mesh for $\mathcal{M}$ and $\partial\mathcal{M}$ with good shaped elements. If $\mathbf{V}$ and $\mathbf{A}$ are not given, they can be estimated as follows.

(1) If a mesh with the vertices $P$ approximating $\mathcal{M}$ is given, both weight vectors $\mathbf{V}$ and $\mathbf{A}$ can be easily estimated from the given mesh by summing up the volume of the simplices incident to the vertices. One can obtain the input data which $h$-integral approximates $\mathcal{M}$ and $\partial\mathcal{M}$ if the size of the elements in the mesh is of order $h$ and the angle between the normal space of an element and the normal space of $\mathcal{M}$ at the vertices of the element is of order $h^{1/2}$ [39]. Note that there is no requirement on the shape of the elements in the mesh.

(2) If the points in $P$ and $S$ are independent samples from uniform distribution on $\mathcal{M}$ and $\partial\mathcal{M}$ respectively, then $\mathbf{V}$ and $\mathbf{A}$ can be taken as the constant vector. The integral of the functions on $\mathcal{M}$ and $\partial\mathcal{M}$ can be estimated using Monte Carol method. In this case, from the central limit theorem, $h$ is of the order of $1/\sqrt{n}$;

(3) Finally, following [31], one can estimate the vectors $\mathbf{V}$ and $\mathbf{A}$ by locally approximating tangent spaces of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\partial\mathcal{M}$, respectively. Specifically, for a point $p \in P$, project the samples near to $p$ in $P$ onto the approximated tangent space at $p$ and take the volume of the Voronoi cell of $p$ as its weight. In this way, one avoids constructing globally consistent meshes for $\mathcal{M}$ and $\partial\mathcal{M}$.

### 3.2 Convergence result

The solution of the Point Integral Method is a vector $\mathbf{u}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ while the solution of the problem (N1) is a function defined on $\mathcal{M}$. To make them comparable, for any solution $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \cdots, u_n)^t$ to the problem (N1) with $b = 0$, we construct a function on $\mathcal{M}$

$$I_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{u})(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{p}_j \in P} R_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}_j) u_j V_j - t \sum_{\mathbf{p}_j \in P} \bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}_j) f_j V_j}{\sum_{\mathbf{p}_j \in P} R_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}_j) V_j}. \tag{3.1}$$

It is easy to verify that $I_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{u})$ interpolates $\mathbf{u}$ at the sample points $P$, i.e., $I_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{u})(\mathbf{p}_j) = u_j$ for any $j$. The following theorem guarantees the convergence of our Point Integral method in solving the problem (N1).

**Theorem 3.1.** *Assume both the submanifolds $\mathcal{M}$ and $\partial\mathcal{M}$ are $C^\infty$ smooth and the input data $(P, S, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{A})$ is an $h$-integral approximation of $(\mathcal{M}, \partial\mathcal{M})$, $u$ is the solution to Problem* (N1) *with $f \in C^2(\mathcal{M})$ and $b = 0$. Set $\mathbf{f} = (f(\mathbf{p}_1), \cdots, f(\mathbf{p}_n))$. If the vector $\mathbf{u}$ is the solution to the problem* (N3) *with $b = 0$. Then there exists constants $C$ and $T_0$ only depend on $\mathcal{M}$ and $\partial\mathcal{M}$, such that for any $t \leq T_0$*

$$\|u - I_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{u})\|_{H^1(\mathcal{M})} \leq C\left(t^{1/2} + \frac{h}{t^{3/2}}\right)\|f\|_{C^2(\mathcal{M})}. \tag{3.2}$$

## 4 Structure of the Proof

Since $\mathcal{M}$ is a $C^\infty$ smooth submanifolds isometrically embedded in $\mathbb{R}^d$, it can be locally parametrized as follows.

$$\mathbf{x} = \Phi(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{R}^d \tag{4.1}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma^1, \cdots, \gamma^k)^t \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and $\mathbf{x} = (x^1, \cdots, x^d)^t \in M$. In what follows, we use the index with prime (e.g, $i'$), respectively without prime (e.g. $i$) to represent the coordinate component of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ in the parameter domain, respectively the coordinate component of $\mathbf{x}$ in the ambient space. We also use Einstein convention for the brevity of notation.

We introduce the following notations which will be used later. Let $\partial_{i'} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma^{i'}}$ be the tangent vector along the direction $\gamma^{i'}$. Since $\mathcal{M}$ is a submanifold in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with induced metric, $\partial_{i'} = (\partial_{i'}\Phi^1, \cdots, \partial_{i'}\Phi^d)$ and the metric tensor

$$g_{i'j'} =< \partial_{i'}, \partial_{j'} >= \partial_{i'}\Phi^l \partial_{j'}\Phi^l.$$

Let $g^{i'j'}$ denote the inverse of $g_{i'j'}$, i.e.,

$$g_{i'l'}\, g^{l'j'} = \delta_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & i = j, \\ 0, & i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

For any function $f$ on $\mathcal{M}$, $\nabla f = g^{i'j'}\partial_{j'} f \partial_{i'}$ denotes the gradient of $f$. We can view the gradient $\nabla f$ as a vector in the ambient space and let $\nabla^j f$ denote the $j$ component of the gradient $\nabla f$ in the ambient coordinates, i.e.,

$$\nabla^j f = \partial_{i'}\Phi^j g^{i'j'}\partial_{j'} f \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_{i'} f = \partial_{i'}\Phi^j \nabla^j f. \tag{4.2}$$

Now, we relates the numerical solution of the problem (N3) to the true solution of the problem (N1). We do so in two steps. In the first step, we show that the truncation error is small by measuring the extent to which the numerical solution and the true solution satisfy the integral equation (Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.2). In the second step, we show that as is $\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}$, the integral Laplace operator $L_t$ is stable (Theorem 4.3 and Theorem 4.6). Note that under the assumptions stated in Section 3.1, for a fixed $t$, $L_t$ is an operator over $L^2(\mathcal{M})$,

**Theorem 4.1.** *Assume both the submanifolds $\mathcal{M}$ and $\partial\mathcal{M}$ are $C^\infty$. Let $u(\mathbf{x})$ be the solution of the problem* (N1) *and $u_t(\mathbf{x})$ be the solution of the corresponding problem* (N2)*. If $u \in C^4(\mathcal{M})$, then there exists constants $C, T_0$ depending only on $\mathcal{M}$ and $\partial\mathcal{M}$, so that for any $t \leq T_0$,*

$$\|L_t(u - u_t) - \varphi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \;\leq\; Ct^{1/2}\|u\|_{C^3(\mathcal{M})}, \text{ and} \tag{4.3}$$

$$\|\nabla\left(L_t(u - u_t) - \varphi\right)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \;\leq\; C\|u\|_{C^4(\mathcal{M})}, \tag{4.4}$$

*where $\varphi(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} n^j(\mathbf{y})\eta^i(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\nabla^i\nabla^j u(\mathbf{y})\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{y}}$ with $\alpha = \Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{x}), \xi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) = \Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{x}) - \Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{y})$ and $\eta(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) = \xi^{i'}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\partial_{i'}\Phi(\alpha)$.*

**Theorem 4.2.** *Assume both the submanifolds $\mathcal{M}$ and $\partial\mathcal{M}$ are $C^\infty$ and the input data $(P, S, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{A})$ is an $h$-integral approximation of $(\mathcal{M}, \partial\mathcal{M})$. Let $u_t(\mathbf{x})$ be the solution of the problem* (N2) *with $b = 0$ and $\mathbf{u}$ be the solution of the problem* (N3) *with $b = 0$. If $f \in C^1(\mathcal{M})$ , in both problems, then there exists constants $C, T_0, r_0$ depending only on $\mathcal{M}$ and $\partial\mathcal{M}$ so that*

$$\|L_t\left(I_{\mathbf{f}}\mathbf{u} - u_t\right)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \;\leq\; \frac{Ch}{t^{3/2}}\|f\|_{C^1(\mathcal{M})}, \tag{4.5}$$

$$\|\nabla L_t\left(I_{\mathbf{f}}\mathbf{u} - u_t\right)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \;\leq\; \frac{Ch}{t^2}\|f\|_{C^1(\mathcal{M})}. \tag{4.6}$$

*as long as $t \leq T_0$ and $\frac{h}{\sqrt{t}} \leq r_0$.*

In Theorem 4.1, the function $\varphi$ is emerged in the operation of integration by parts. Pointwisely, the function $\varphi$ is of order 1. However, $\varphi$ has a small support along the boundary and one can show that its $L^2$ norm is of order $t^{1/4}$. Furthermore, in Theorem 4.6, we will show that $L_t$ has a better stability result for this special truncation error $\varphi$, which leads to an even better convergence rate for $u_t$. This is why we single out the term $\varphi$ in the truncation error. Note that the proof of the above two theorems becomes less involved if the dimension $k$ of $\mathcal{M}$ appears on the exponent of $t$.

**Theorem 4.3.** *Assume both the submanifolds $\mathcal{M}$ and $\partial\mathcal{M}$ are $C^\infty$, and $u(\mathbf{x})$ solves the following equation*

$$-L_t u = r(\mathbf{x}) - \bar{r} \tag{4.7}$$

*where $r \in H^1(\mathcal{M})$ and $\bar{r} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}|}\int_{\mathcal{M}} r(\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}$. Then, there exist constants $C > 0, T_0 > 0$ independent on $t$, such that*

$$\|u\|_{H^1(\mathcal{M})} \leq C\left(\|r\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + t\|\nabla r\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})}\right) \tag{4.8}$$

*as long as $t \leq T_0$.*

To put the above stability of $L_t$ into perspective, consider the Poisson equation $-\Delta_{\mathcal{M}} u = r - \bar{r}$ with the Neumann boundary, and it is well-known that $\|u\|_{H^1(\mathcal{M})} \leq C\|r\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})}$. However, for the equation $-L_t u = r(\mathbf{x}) - \bar{r}$, the bound on $\|u\|_{H^1(\mathcal{M})}$ has an extra term involving $\|\nabla r\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})}$. In fact, this is due to that the operator $L_t$ has a weaker coercivity comparing to the $\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}$ as stated in Theorem 4.4 and Theorem 4.5.

**Theorem 4.4.** *For any function $u \in L^2(\mathcal{M})$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ independent on $t$ and $u$, such that*

$$\langle u, L_t u\rangle_{\mathcal{M}} \geq C\int_{\mathcal{M}} |\nabla v|^2, \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \tag{4.9}$$

*where $\langle f, g\rangle_{\mathcal{M}} = \int_{\mathcal{M}} f(\mathbf{x})g(\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}$ for any $f, g \in L_2(\mathcal{M})$, and*

$$v(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{C_t}{w_t(\mathbf{x})}\int_{\mathcal{M}} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right) u(\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}, \tag{4.10}$$

*and $w_t(\mathbf{x}) = C_t\int_{\mathcal{M}} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right)\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}$.*

**Theorem 4.5.** *Assume both $\mathcal{M}$ and $\partial\mathcal{M}$ are $C^\infty$. There exists a constant $C > 0$ independent on $t$ so that for any function $u \in L_2(\mathcal{M})$ with $\int_{\mathcal{M}} u = 0$ and for any sufficient small $t$*

$$\langle u, L_t u\rangle_{\mathcal{M}} \geq C\|u\|^2_{L_2(\mathcal{M})} \tag{4.11}$$

Note in the above two theorems, the constant $C$ is independent of $t$, which is critical in our proof. For the LBO, the quadratic form $\langle u, \Delta_{\mathcal{M}} u\rangle_{\mathcal{M}}$ is bounded below by the $H^1$ norm of $u$. However, in Theorem 4.4, the quadratic form $\langle u, L_t u\rangle_{\mathcal{M}}$ is bounded below by the $H^1$ norm of a smoothed function $v$, instead of $u$ itself. This is the best one can hope. Indeed, if $u$ oscillates at the scale much smaller than $\sqrt{t}$, $\|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})}$ can be much larger than $\langle u, L_t u\rangle_{\mathcal{M}}$.

**Theorem 4.6.** *Assume both the submanifolds $\mathcal{M}$ and $\partial\mathcal{M}$ are $C^\infty$ smooth. Let*

$$r(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} b^i(\mathbf{y})\eta^i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{y}}$$

*where $b^i(\mathbf{y}) \in L^\infty(\partial\mathcal{M})$ for any $1 \leq i \leq d$ and $\eta$ is the same as defined in Theorem 4.1. Assume $u(\mathbf{x})$ solves the following equation*

$$-L_t u = r - \bar{r}, \tag{4.12}$$

*where $\bar{r} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}|}\int_{\mathcal{M}} r(\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}$. Then, there exist constants $C > 0, T_0 > 0$ independent on $t$, such that*

$$\|u\|_{H^1(\mathcal{M})} \leq C\sqrt{t}\ \max_i\left(\|b^i\|_\infty\right). \tag{4.13}$$

*as long as $t \leq T_0$.*

Now we prove Theorem 3.1, which is an easy consequence of Theorem 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, and 4.6.

*Proof. of Theorem 3.1*
Set $r = -L_t(u - u_t) + \varphi$, where $\varphi = \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} b^i(\mathbf{y})\eta^i(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{y}}$ and $b^i(\mathbf{y}) = n^j(\mathbf{y})\nabla^i\nabla^j u(\mathbf{y})$. Then we have $\bar{r} = \bar{\varphi}$ and thus $-L_t(u - u_t) + (\varphi - \bar{\varphi}) = r - \bar{r}$, where $\bar{r}$ and $\bar{\varphi}$ are average value of $r$ and $\varphi$ over $\mathcal{M}$. Assume $v$ solves the equation $L_t v = \varphi - \bar{\varphi}$. By Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.3, we have

$$\|u - u_t - v\|_{H^1(\mathcal{M})} \leq Ct^{1/2}\|u\|_{C^3(\mathcal{M})} + Ct\|u\|_{C^4(\mathcal{M})}$$

for some constant $C$ and any small enough $t$. On the other hand, for any $1 \leq i \leq d$, we have $\|b^i\|_\infty = C\|u\|_{C^2(\mathcal{M})}$ for some constant $C$. Then, by Theorem 4.6,

$$\|v\|_{H^1(\mathcal{M})} \leq C\sqrt{t}\|u\|_{C^2(\mathcal{M})}$$

for some constant $C$ and any small enough $t$. Thus we have

$$\|u - u_t\|_{H^1(\mathcal{M})} \leq Ct^{1/2}\|u\|_{C^2(\mathcal{M})} + Ct^{1/2}\|u\|_{C^3(\mathcal{M})} + Ct\|u\|_{C^4(\mathcal{M})} \leq Ct^{1/2}\|u\|_{C^4(\mathcal{M})}$$

On the other hand, using Theorem 4.2 and Theorem 4.3, we obtain

$$\|u_t - u_{t,h}\|_{H^1(\mathcal{M})} \leq \frac{Ch}{t^{3/2}}\|f\|_{C^1(\mathcal{M})} \tag{4.14}$$

Combining the above two estimates, we obtain

$$\|u - u_{t,h}\|_{H^1(\mathcal{M})} \leq Ct^{1/2}\|u\|_{C^4(\mathcal{M})} + \frac{Ch}{t^{3/2}}\|f\|_{C^1(\mathcal{M})} \tag{4.15}$$

Then, using the following well known results on the regularity of the solution to the Poisson equation, we have

$$\|u\|_{C^4(\mathcal{M})} \leq C\|f\|_{C^2(\mathcal{M})}, \tag{4.16}$$

which completes the proof. □

# 5 Discussion and Future Work

We have described the Point Integral method (PIM) for numerically solving the Poisson equations on the submanifolds isometrically embedded in Euclidean spaces, and shown the convergence guarantees of the PIM. Our analysis shows that the convergence rate of PIM is $h^{1/2}$ in $H^1$ norm where $h$ is proportion to the sampling density. However, our experimental results in [29], show the empirical convergence rate is about linear. Indeed, there are places in our analysis where we believe the error bounds can be improved. In addition, there are also rooms to improve the algorithm to achieve a better convergence rate. We are working to improve the PIM to obtain higher accuracy by designing proper kernel functions and utilizing more accurate quadrature procedure for discretizing the integral equation.

The point integral method can be generalized to solve other PDEs, for example, the elliptic equations with variable coefficients or jump coefficients. We are also working to apply the PIM to solve the PDEs with time evolution, for instance, convection-diffusion equation on manifold. Recently, the eigensystem of the Laplace-Beltrami operator has attracted many attentions in various areas including machine learning, geometric modeling, and data analysis. The point integral method can be used to solve this problem very naturally. Moreover, with the help of the convergence results in this paper, we can prove the convergence of the point integral method for the eigenvalue problem of Laplace-Beltrami operator on point cloud and also give an estimate of the convergence rate. This work will be reported in our subsequent paper.

Another interesting problem worth investigating is the property of the integral equations (N2) as they can be easily discretized and well approximated from point clouds. For instance, what is the regularity of the

solutions to the integral equations when $t$ goes to 0. Furthermore, those integral equations are well-defined on more general spaces, like multiple manifolds with self intersections or even general stratified spaces. One may study how to infer the structures of the underlying complicated spaces from the behavior of those integral equations.

# 6 Basic Estimates

In this section, we show some basic estimates which will be used frequently in the proof later on. Since we are interested in the convergence behavior of the operators as $t$ goes to 0, the involved estimates need to hold only for sufficiently small $t$. We consider the local parametrization of the submanifolds $\mathcal{M}$ and $\partial\mathcal{M}$. Let $r$ be the minimum of the reaches of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\partial\mathcal{M}$. We have $r > 0$ if both $\mathcal{M}$ and $\partial\mathcal{M}$ are $C^2$ smooth.

**Proposition 6.1.** Assume both $\mathcal{M}$ and $\partial\mathcal{M}$ are $C^2$ smooth and $r$ is the minimum of the reaches of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\partial\mathcal{M}$. For any point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}$, there is a neighborhood $U \subset \mathcal{M}$ of $\mathbf{x}$, so that there is a parametrization $\Phi : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^k \to U$ satisfying the following conditions. For any $\rho \leq 0.1$,

(i) $\Omega$ is convex and contains at least half of the ball $B_{\Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{x})}(\frac{\rho}{5}r)$, i.e., $vol(\Omega \cap B_{\Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{x})}(\frac{\rho}{5}r)) > \frac{1}{2}(\frac{\rho}{5}r)^k w_k$ where $w_k$ is the volume of unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^k$;

(ii) $B_{\mathbf{x}}(\frac{\rho}{10}r) \cap \mathcal{M} \subset U$.

(iii) The determinant the Jacobian of $\Phi$ is bounded: $(1-2\rho)^k \leq |D\Phi| \leq (1+2\rho)^k$ over $\Omega$.

(iv) For any points $\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \in U$, $1 - 2\rho \leq \frac{|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{z}|}{|\Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{y})-\Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{z})|} \leq 1 + 3\rho$.

This proposition basically says there exists a local parametrization of small distortion if $(\mathcal{M}, \partial\mathcal{M})$ satisfies certain smoothness, and moreover, the parameter domain is convex and big enough. Its proof can be found in Appendix A in the supplementary material. It has the following corollaries which are important in our proof. Their proofs are straightforward once we change the variables to those in the Euclidean parameter domain. Note that the lower bound in Corollary 6.1 relies on the fact that the parameter domain $\Omega$ is big. The convexity of the parameter domain $\Omega$ is used in the proof of Lemma 7.2 and Theorem 4.1.

**Corollary 6.1.** Assume both $\mathcal{M}$ and $\partial\mathcal{M}$ are $C^2$ smooth. For sufficiently small $t$ and any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}$, there are constants $w_{\min}, w_{\max}$ depending only on the geometry of $\mathcal{M}, \partial\mathcal{M}$, so that

$$w_{\min} \leq \int_{\mathcal{M}} R_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \leq w_{\max}.$$

**Corollary 6.2.** Assume both $\mathcal{M}$ and $\partial\mathcal{M}$ are $C^2$ smooth. For sufficiently small $t$ and any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, there is a constant $C$ depending only on the geometry of $\mathcal{M}, \partial\mathcal{M}$, so that for $i = 0, 1, 2$ and any integer $s \geq 0$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}} R_t^{(i)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^s \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \leq C t^{s/2}, \text{ and}$$
$$\int_{\mathcal{M}} \bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^s \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \leq C t^{s/2},$$

where $R^{(i)}$ denote the $i$th derivative of $R$.

The above two corollaries lead to the bounds on the convolution using the integral kernel $R_t, R_t'$ and $\bar{R}$.

**Corollary 6.3.** Assume both $\mathcal{M}$ and $\partial\mathcal{M}$ are $C^2$ smooth. For any function $f \in L^2(\mathcal{M})$, let $u(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\mathcal{M}} K_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) f(\mathbf{y}) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}$ where $K_t$ can be $R_t, R_t'$ and $\bar{R}_t$. For sufficiently small $t$ and any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}$, there is a constant $C$ depending only on the geometry of $\mathcal{M}, \partial\mathcal{M}$, so that

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \leq C\|f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})}, \text{ and } \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \leq \frac{C}{t^{1/2}}\|f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})}, \tag{6.1}$$

and moreover, if $f \in C(\mathcal{M})$,

$$\|u\|_{C^1(\mathcal{M})} \leq \frac{C}{t^{1/2}}\|f\|_{\infty}. \tag{6.2}$$

*Proof.* We prove the corollary for $K_t = R_t$. The other cases can be done in the exact same way. Using Hölder inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} &= \int_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \int_{\mathcal{M}} C_t R\left( \frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t} \right) f(\mathbf{y}) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \right)^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \\
&\leq \int_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \int_{\mathcal{M}} C_t R\left( \frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t} \right) f^2(\mathbf{y}) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \right) \left( \int_{\mathcal{M}} C_t R\left( \frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t} \right) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \right) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \\
&\leq C\|f\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to Corollary 6.2.

The gradient of $u(\mathbf{x})$ on $\mathcal{M}$ is the projection of the gradient of $u(\mathbf{x})$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$, which means

$$\begin{aligned}
|\nabla u(\mathbf{x})|^2 &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{d} \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial x^i} \right)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \left( \int_{\mathcal{M}} C_t R'\left( \frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t} \right) \frac{x^i - y^i}{2t} f(\mathbf{y}) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \right)^2 \\
&\leq \left( \int_{\mathcal{M}} C_t R'\left( \frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t} \right) \frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t^2} \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \right) \left( \int_{\mathcal{M}} C_t R'\left( \frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t} \right) f^2(\mathbf{y}) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{C}{t} \int_{\mathcal{M}} C_t R'\left( \frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t} \right) f^2(\mathbf{y}) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then we have $\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \leq \frac{C}{t^{1/2}}\|f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})}$ and if $f$ is continuous then $\|\nabla u\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{C}{t^{1/2}}\|f\|_{\infty}$. It is obvious that $\|u\|_{\infty} \leq C\|f\|_{\infty}$. This proves the corollary. □

# 7 Coercivity of $L_t$

In this section, we prove Theorem 4.4 and 4.5, which show that the integral Laplace operator $L_t$ preserve the coercivity of the Laplace-Beltrami operator but in a slightly weaker form. To prove them, we first state the following two lemmas.

**Lemma 7.1.** *For any function $u \in L^2(\mathcal{M})$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ independent on $t$ and $u$, such that*

$$\frac{C_t}{t} \int_{\mathcal{M}} \int_{\mathcal{M}} R\left( \frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{32t} \right) (u(\mathbf{x}) - u(\mathbf{y}))^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \geq C \int_{\mathcal{M}} |\nabla v|^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}$$

*where $v$ is the same as defined in* (4.10).

**Lemma 7.2.** *If $t$ is small enough, then for any function $u \in L^2(\mathcal{M})$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ independent on $t$ and $u$, such that*

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}} \int_{\mathcal{M}} R\left( \frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{32t} \right) (u(\mathbf{x}) - u(\mathbf{y}))^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \leq C \int_{\mathcal{M}} \int_{\mathcal{M}} R\left( \frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t} \right) (u(\mathbf{x}) - u(\mathbf{y}))^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}.$$

To make the paper concise and easy to read, the proof of the above two lemmas are put in Appendix B and C. Once we have Lemma 7.1 and Lemma 7.2, Theorem 4.4 becomes obvious by noticing that:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle u, L_t u\rangle_{\mathcal{M}} &= \int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right) u(\mathbf{x})(u(\mathbf{x})-u(\mathbf{y}))\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \\ &= -\int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right) u(\mathbf{y})(u(\mathbf{x})-u(\mathbf{y}))\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right) (u(\mathbf{x})-u(\mathbf{y}))^2\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}.\end{aligned}$$

Now, we turn to prove Theorem 4.5.

*Proof.* of Theorem 4.5
By Theorem 4.4 and the Poincare inequality, there exists a constant $C>0$, such that

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}}(v(\mathbf{x})-\bar{v})^2\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \le \frac{CC_t}{t}\int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right)(u(\mathbf{x})-u(\mathbf{y}))^2\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \tag{7.1}$$

where $\bar{v}=\frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}|}\int_{\mathcal{M}} v(\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}$. At the same time, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&|\mathcal{M}||\bar{v}| = \left|\int_{\mathcal{M}} v(\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\right| \\ =\ &\left|\int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} \frac{C_t}{w_t(\mathbf{x})} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right)(u(\mathbf{y})-u(\mathbf{x}))\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\right| \\ \le\ &\left(\int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} \frac{C_t}{w_t(\mathbf{x})} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right)\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\right)^{1/2} \\ &\left(\int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} \frac{C_t}{w_t(\mathbf{x})} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right)(u(\mathbf{y})-u(\mathbf{x}))^2\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\right)^{1/2} \\ \le\ &C|\mathcal{M}|^{1/2}\left(C_t\int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right)(u(\mathbf{y})-u(\mathbf{x}))^2\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\right)^{1/2}\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality is due to $\int_{\mathcal{M}} u = 0$. This enables us to upper bound the $L_2$ norm of $v$ as follows. For $t$ sufficiently small,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{M}}(v(\mathbf{x}))^2\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} &\le 2\int_M (v(\mathbf{x})-\bar{v})^2\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} + 2\int_M \bar{v}^2\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \\ &\le \frac{CC_t}{t}\int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right)(u(\mathbf{x})-u(\mathbf{y}))^2\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\end{aligned}$$

Let $\delta = \frac{w_{\min}}{2w_{\max}+w_{\min}}$. If $u$ is smooth and close to its smoothed version $v$, in particular,

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}} v^2(\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \ge \delta^2\int_{\mathcal{M}} u^2(\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}, \tag{7.2}$$

then we have shown $< L_t u, u >_{\mathcal{M}} \ge C\|u\|^2_{L_2(\mathcal{M})}$ for some constant $C$, which proves the theorem.

Now consider the case where (7.2) does not hold. Note that we now have

$$\begin{aligned}\|u-v\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} &\ge \|u\|_{L_2(\mathcal{M})} - \|v\|_{L_2(\mathcal{M})} > (1-\delta)\|u\|_{L_2(\mathcal{M})} \\ &> \frac{1-\delta}{\delta}\|v\|_{L_2(\mathcal{M})} = \frac{2w_{\max}}{w_{\min}}\|v\|_{L_2(\mathcal{M})}.\end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{C_t}{t}\int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right)(u(\mathbf{x})-u(\mathbf{y}))^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\\
=\ &\frac{2C_t}{t}\int_{\mathcal{M}} u(\mathbf{x})\int_{\mathcal{M}} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right)(u(\mathbf{x})-u(\mathbf{y}))\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\\
=\ &\frac{2}{t}\left(\int_{\mathcal{M}} u^2(\mathbf{x})w(\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}-\int_{\mathcal{M}} u(\mathbf{x})v(\mathbf{x})w(\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\right)\\
=\ &\frac{2}{t}\left(\int_{\mathcal{M}} (u(\mathbf{x})-v(\mathbf{x}))^2 w(\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}+\int_{\mathcal{M}} (u(\mathbf{x})-v(\mathbf{x}))v(\mathbf{x})w(\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\right)\\
\geq\ &\frac{2}{t}\int_{\mathcal{M}} (u(\mathbf{x})-v(\mathbf{x}))^2 w(\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}-\frac{2}{t}\left(\int_{\mathcal{M}} v^2(\mathbf{x})w(\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\right)^{1/2}\left(\int_{\mathcal{M}} (u(\mathbf{x})-v(\mathbf{x}))^2 w(\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\right)^{1/2}\\
\geq\ &\frac{2w_{\min}}{t}\int_{\mathcal{M}} (u(\mathbf{x})-v(\mathbf{x}))^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}-\frac{2w_{\max}}{t}\left(\int_{\mathcal{M}} v^2(\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\right)^{1/2}\left(\int_{\mathcal{M}} (u(\mathbf{x})-v(\mathbf{x}))^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\right)^{1/2}\\
\geq\ &\frac{w_{\min}}{t}\int_{\mathcal{M}} (u(\mathbf{x})-v(\mathbf{x}))^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\geq\frac{w_{\min}}{t}(1-\delta)^2\int_{\mathcal{M}} u^2(\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

This completes the proof for the theorem. □

# 8 Error analysis of the integral approximation (Theorem 4.1)

In this section, we prove Theorem 4.1. Specifically, we analyze the consistency of the integral equations (N2), that is how well the true solution to the Poisson equations satisfies the integral equations.

*Proof.* of Theorem 4.1

Let $r(\mathbf{x}) = -(L_t u - L_t u_t)$ be the residual, then we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
r(\mathbf{x}) &= -\frac{1}{t}\int_{\mathcal{M}} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})(u(\mathbf{x})-u(\mathbf{y}))\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}+2\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}}\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})g(\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{y}}-\int_{\mathcal{M}}\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})f(\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\\
&= -\frac{1}{t}\int_{\mathcal{M}} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})(u(\mathbf{x})-u(\mathbf{y}))\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}+\int_{\mathcal{M}}\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}u(\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\\
&\quad+\frac{1}{t}\int_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})\cdot\nabla u(\mathbf{y})R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\\
&= -\frac{1}{t}\int_{\mathcal{M}} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})(u(\mathbf{x})-u(\mathbf{y})-(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})\cdot\nabla u(\mathbf{y}))\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}+\int_{\mathcal{M}}\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}u(\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Here we use that fact that

$$
\int_{\mathcal{M}}\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})f(\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}=\int_{\mathcal{M}}\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}u(\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}},
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}}\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})g(\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{y}} &= \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}}\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\frac{\partial u}{\partial\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{y}}\\
&= \int_{\mathcal{M}}\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}u(\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}+\int_{\mathcal{M}}\nabla_{\mathbf{y}}\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\cdot\nabla u(\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\\
&= \int_{\mathcal{M}}\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}u(\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}+\frac{1}{2t}\int_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})\cdot\nabla u(\mathbf{y})R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}},
\end{aligned}
$$

where the last equality is due to Equation (4.2):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathcal{M}} \nabla u(\mathbf{y}) \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \qquad (8.1)\\
=\ & \frac{1}{2t} \int_{\mathcal{M}} \left(\partial_{i'} \Phi^l g^{i'j'} \partial_{j'} u(\mathbf{y})\right) \left(\partial_{m'} \Phi^l g^{m'n'} \partial_{n'} \Phi^j (x^j - y^j) R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\right) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\\
=\ & \frac{1}{2t} \int_{\mathcal{M}} \left(\partial_{n'} \Phi^j g^{j'n'} \partial_{j'} u(\mathbf{y})\right) \left((x^j - y^j) R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\right) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\\
=\ & \frac{1}{2t} \int_{\mathcal{M}} (x^j - y^j) \nabla^j u(\mathbf{y}) R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\\
=\ & \frac{1}{2t} \int_{\mathcal{M}} (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \cdot \nabla u(\mathbf{y}) R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}.
\end{aligned}$$

For a fixed $\mathbf{x}$, the function $R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ has a support of $B_{\mathbf{x}}(2\sqrt{t}) \cap \mathcal{M}$. When $t$ is sufficiently small, we only need to consider the function $u$ at a neighborhood of $\mathbf{x}$. As stated in Proposition 6.1, there exists a nice local parametrization $\Phi : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^k \to U \subset \mathcal{M}$, such that

1. $\left(B_{\mathbf{x}}(2\sqrt{t}) \cap \mathcal{M}\right) \subset U$ and $\Omega$ is convex.
2. $\Phi \in C^3(\Omega)$;
3. For any points $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \Omega$, $\frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| \le \|\Phi(\mathbf{x}) - \Phi(\mathbf{y})\| \le 2|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|$.

Moreover, we denote $\Phi(\beta) = \mathbf{x}, \Phi(\alpha) = \mathbf{y}, \xi = \beta - \alpha, \eta = \xi^i \partial_i \Phi(\alpha)$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
r_1(\mathbf{x}) &= -\frac{1}{t} \int_{\mathcal{M}} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \left(u(\mathbf{x}) - u(\mathbf{y}) - (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \cdot \nabla u(\mathbf{y}) - \frac{1}{2} \eta^i \eta^j (\nabla^i \nabla^j u(\mathbf{y}))\right) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\\
r_2(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{1}{2t} \int_{\mathcal{M}} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \eta^i \eta^j (\nabla^i \nabla^j u(\mathbf{y})) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} - \int_{\mathcal{M}} \eta^i (\nabla^i \nabla^j u(\mathbf{y}) \nabla^j \bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\\
r_3(\mathbf{x}) &= \int_{\mathcal{M}} \eta^i (\nabla^i \nabla^j u(\mathbf{y}) \nabla^j \bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} + \int_{\mathcal{M}} \mathrm{div}\ \left(\eta^i (\nabla^i \nabla^j u(\mathbf{y})\right) \bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\\
r_4(\mathbf{x}) &= \int_{\mathcal{M}} \mathrm{div}\ \left(\eta^i (\nabla^i \nabla^j u(\mathbf{y})\right) \bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} + \int_{\mathcal{M}} \bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \Delta_{\mathcal{M}} u(\mathbf{y}) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$r(\mathbf{x}) = r_1(\mathbf{x}) - r_2(\mathbf{x}) - r_3(\mathbf{x}) + r_4(\mathbf{x}). \qquad (8.2)$$

We prove the theorem by estimating the above four terms one by one. First, let us consider $r_1$. Using the fact that $\Omega$ is convex and the Newton-Leibniz formula, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&u(\mathbf{x}) - u(\mathbf{y}) - (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \cdot \nabla u(\mathbf{y}) - \frac{1}{2} \eta^i \eta^j (\nabla^i \nabla^j u(\mathbf{y}))\\
=\ & \xi^i \xi^{i'} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \frac{d}{ds_3} \left(\partial_i \Phi^j (\alpha + s_2 s_1 \xi) \partial_{i'} \Phi^{j'} (\alpha + s_3 s_2 s_1 \xi) \nabla^{j'} \nabla^j u(\Phi(\alpha + s_3 s_2 s_1 \xi))\right)\\
&\qquad s_1 \mathrm{d}s_3 \mathrm{d}s_2 \mathrm{d}s_1\\
=\ & \xi^i \xi^{i'} \xi^{i''} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \partial_i \Phi^j (\alpha + s_2 s_1 \xi) \partial_{i''} \partial_{i'} \Phi^{j'} (\alpha + s_3 s_2 s_1 \xi) \nabla^{j'} \nabla^j u(\Phi(\alpha + s_3 s_2 s_1 \xi))\\
&\qquad s_1^2 s_2 \mathrm{d}s_3 \mathrm{d}s_2 \mathrm{d}s_1\\
&+ \xi^i \xi^{i'} \xi^{i''} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 s_1^2 s_2 \partial_i \Phi^j (\alpha + s_2 s_1 \xi) \partial_{i'} \Phi^{j'} (\alpha + s_3 s_2 s_1 \xi) \partial_{i''} \Phi^{j''} (\alpha + s_3 s_2 s_1 \xi)\\
&\qquad \nabla^{j''} \nabla^{j'} \nabla^j u(\Phi(\alpha + s_3 s_2 s_1 \xi)) \mathrm{d}s_3 \mathrm{d}s_2 \mathrm{d}s_1,
\end{aligned}$$

which together with the assumption $\Phi \in C^3(\Omega)$ leads to that

$$\left|u(\mathbf{x}) - u(\mathbf{y}) - (\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})\cdot\nabla u(\mathbf{y}) - \frac{1}{2}\eta^i\eta^j(\nabla^i\nabla^j u(\mathbf{y}))\right| \le C|\xi|^3\|u\|_{C^3(\mathcal{M})}, \text{ and}$$
$$\left|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\left(u(\mathbf{x}) - u(\mathbf{y}) - (\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})\cdot\nabla u(\mathbf{y}) - \frac{1}{2}\eta^i\eta^j(\nabla^i\nabla^j u(\mathbf{y}))\right)\right| \le C|\xi|^2\|u\|_{C^3(\mathcal{M})} + C|\xi|^3\|u\|_{C^4(\mathcal{M})}.$$

Then we have

$$|r_1(\mathbf{x})| \le \frac{C}{t}\|u\|_{C^3(\mathcal{M})}\int_{\mathcal{M}} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})|\xi|^3 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \le Ct^{1/2}\|u\|_{C^3(\mathcal{M})}, \tag{8.3}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla r_1(\mathbf{x})| \;&\le\; \frac{C}{t}\|u\|_{C^3(\mathcal{M})}\int_{\mathcal{M}} |\xi|^2\left(R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) + \nabla R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})|\xi|\right)\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \\ &\quad + \frac{C}{t}\|u\|_{C^4(\mathcal{M})}\int_{\mathcal{M}} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})|\xi|^3\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \\ &\le\; C\|u\|_{C^3(\mathcal{M})} + Ct^{1/2}\|u\|_{C^4(\mathcal{M})} \end{aligned} \tag{8.4}$$

Next, we bound $r_2$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^j\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \;&=\; \frac{1}{2t}\partial_{m'}\Phi^j(\alpha)g^{m'n'}\partial_{n'}\Phi^i(\alpha)(x^i - y^i)R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}), \text{ and} \\ \frac{\eta^j}{2t}R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \;&=\; \frac{1}{2t}\partial_{m'}\Phi^j(\alpha)g^{m'n'}\partial_{n'}\Phi^i(\alpha)\xi^{i'}\partial_{i'}\Phi^i R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}). \end{aligned}$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\nabla^j\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) - \frac{\eta^j}{2t}R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{2t}\partial_{m'}\Phi^j g^{m'n'}\partial_{n'}\Phi^i\left(x^i - y^i - \xi^{i'}\partial_{i'}\Phi^i\right)R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \\ =\; &\frac{1}{2t}\xi^{i'}\xi^{j'}\partial_{m'}\Phi^i g^{m'n'}\partial_{n'}\Phi^i\left(\int_0^1\int_0^1 s\partial_{j'}\partial_{i'}\Phi^i(\alpha+\tau s\xi)\mathrm{d}\tau\mathrm{d}s\right)R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}), \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\left|\nabla^j\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) - \frac{\eta^j}{2t}R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\right| \le \frac{C|\xi|^2}{t}R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}), \text{ and} \tag{8.5}$$

$$\left|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\left(\nabla^j\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) - \frac{\eta^j}{2t}R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\right)\right| \le \frac{C|\xi|}{t}R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) + \frac{C|\xi|^3}{t^2}|R_t'(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})|. \tag{8.6}$$

We reach a bound for $r_2$ as follows:

$$|r_2(\mathbf{x})| \;\le\; C\|u\|_{C^2(\mathcal{M})}\int_{\mathcal{M}}\frac{|\xi|^3}{t}R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \le Ct^{1/2}\|u\|_{C^2(\mathcal{M})}, \tag{8.7}$$

$$|\nabla r_2(\mathbf{x})| \;\le\; C\|u\|_{C^2(\mathcal{M})}\int_{\mathcal{M}}\frac{|\xi|^2}{t}\left(R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) + \frac{|\xi|^2}{t}|R_t'(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})|\right)\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \le C\|u\|_{C^2(\mathcal{M})}. \tag{8.8}$$

For $r_3$, the well-known Gauss formula gives that

$$r_3(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} n^j\eta^i(\nabla^i\nabla^j u)\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{y}} = \varphi(\mathbf{x}). \tag{8.9}$$

Finally, we turn to bound the last term $r_4$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla^j\left(\nabla^j u\right) &= (\partial_{k'}\Phi^j)g^{k'l'}\partial_{l'}\left((\partial_{m'}\Phi^j)g^{m'n'}(\partial_{n'}u)\right)\\
&= (\partial_{k'}\Phi^j)g^{k'l'}\left(\partial_{l'}(\partial_{m'}\Phi^j)\right)g^{m'n'}(\partial_{n'}u)\\
&\quad +(\partial_{k'}\Phi^j)g^{k'l'}(\partial_{m'}\Phi^j)\partial_{l'}\left(g^{m'n'}(\partial_{n'}u)\right)\\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{g}}(\partial_{m'}\sqrt{g})g^{m'n'}(\partial_{n'}u)+\partial_{m'}\left(g^{m'n'}(\partial_{n'}u)\right)\\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{g}}\partial_{m'}\left(\sqrt{g}g^{m'n'}(\partial_{n'}u)\right)=\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}u,
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\partial_{k'}\Phi^j)g^{k'l'}\left(\partial_{l'}(\partial_{m'}\Phi^j)\right)\\
=\ &(\partial_{k'}\Phi^j)g^{k'l'}\left(\partial_{m'}(\partial_{l'}\Phi^j)\right)\\
=\ &(\partial_{m'}(\partial_{k'}\Phi^j))g^{k'l'}(\partial_{l'}\Phi^j)\\
=\ &\frac{1}{2}g^{k'l'}\partial_{m'}(g_{k'l'})=\frac{1}{\sqrt{g}}(\partial_{m'}\sqrt{g}).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&g^{i'j'}(\partial_{j'}\Phi^j)(\partial_{i'}\xi^l)(\partial_l\Phi^i)(\nabla^i\nabla^j u)\\
=\ &-g^{i'j'}(\partial_{j'}\Phi^j)(\partial_{i'}\Phi^i)(\nabla^i\nabla^j u)\\
=\ &-g^{i'j'}(\partial_{j'}\Phi^j)(\partial_{i'}\Phi^i)(\partial_{m'}\Phi^i)g^{m'n'}\partial_{n'}\left(\nabla^j u\right)\\
=\ &-g^{i'j'}(\partial_{j'}\Phi^j)\partial_{i'}\left(\nabla^j u\right)\\
=\ &-\nabla^j\left(\nabla^j u\right)
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality is due to that $\partial_{i'}\xi^l=-\delta^l_{i'}$, and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{div}\ \left(\eta^i(\nabla^i\nabla^j u(\mathbf{y}))\right)+\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}u\\
=\ &\frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}}\partial_{i'}\left(\sqrt{|g|}g^{i'j'}(\partial_{j'}\Phi^j)\xi^l(\partial_l\Phi^i)(\nabla^i\nabla^j u(\mathbf{y}))\right)\\
&-g^{i'j'}(\partial_{j'}\Phi^j)(\partial_{i'}\xi^l)(\partial_l\Phi^i)(\nabla^i\nabla^j u)\\
=\ &\frac{\xi^l}{\sqrt{|g|}}\partial_{i'}\left(\sqrt{|g|}g^{i'j'}(\partial_{j'}\Phi^j)(\partial_l\Phi^i)(\nabla^i\nabla^j u(\mathbf{y}))\right)
\end{aligned}$$

where we utilize the equality (8.10), (8.10), $\eta^i=\xi^l\partial_{i'}\Phi^l$ and the definition of div

$$\text{div}X=\frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}}\partial_{i'}(\sqrt{|g|}g^{i'j'}\partial_{j'}\Phi^k X^k),$$

where $X$ is a smooth tangent vector field on $\mathcal{M}$ and $(X^1,\ldots,X^d)^t$ is its representation in the embedding coordinates. Hence

$$r_4(\mathbf{x})=\int_{\mathcal{M}}\frac{\xi^l}{\sqrt{|g|}}\partial_{i'}\left(\sqrt{|g|}g^{i'j'}(\partial_{j'}\Phi^j)(\partial_l\Phi^i)(\nabla^i\nabla^j u(\mathbf{y}))\right)\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}},$$

from which one can derive

$$|r_4(\mathbf{x})| \ \le\ Ct^{1/2}\|u\|_{C^3(\mathcal{M})},\ \text{and} \tag{8.10}$$

$$|\nabla r_4(\mathbf{x})| \ \le\ C\|u\|_{C^3(\mathcal{M})}. \tag{8.11}$$

The theorem follows from (8.3),(8.4),(8.7),(8.8),(8.9), (8.10), and (8.11). □

# 9 Error analysis of the discretization (Theorem 4.2)

In this section, we estimate the discretization error introduced by approximating the integrals in (N2) that is to prove Theorem 4.2. To simplify the notation, we introduce a intermediate operator defined as follows,

$$L_{t,h}u(\mathbf{x}) \;=\; \frac{1}{t}\sum_{\mathbf{p}_j\in P} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j)(u(\mathbf{x})-u(\mathbf{p}_j))V_j, \text{ and} \tag{9.1}$$

If $u_{t,h} = I_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{u})$ with $\mathbf{u}$ satisfying Equation (N3) with $b = 0$. One can verify that the following two equations are satisfied,

$$-L_{t,h}u_{t,h}(\mathbf{x}) \;=\; \sum_{\mathbf{p}_j\in P} \bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j)f(\mathbf{p}_j)V_j, \text{ and} \tag{9.2}$$

We introduce a discrete operator $\mathcal{L}:\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}^n$ where $n = |P|$. For any $\mathbf{u} = (u_1,\cdots,u_n)^t$, denote

$$(\mathcal{L}\mathbf{u})_i \;=\; \frac{1}{t}\sum_{\mathbf{p}_j\in P} R_t(\mathbf{p}_i,\mathbf{p}_j)(u_i-u_j)V_j. \tag{9.3}$$

For this operator, we have the following important theorem which says that $\mathcal{L}$ is elliptic.

**Theorem 9.1.** *If both the submanifolds $\mathcal{M}$ and $\partial\mathcal{M}$ are $C^\infty$ smooth and the input data $(P,S,\mathbf{V},\mathbf{A})$ is an $h$-integral approximation of $(\mathcal{M},\partial\mathcal{M})$, then there exist constants $C>0$, $C_0>0$ independent on $t$ so that for any $\mathbf{u} = (u_1,\cdots,u_n)^t\in\mathbb{R}^d$ with $\sum_{i=1}^n u_iV_i = 0$ and for any sufficient small $t$ and $\frac{h}{\sqrt{t}}$*

$$\langle \mathbf{u},\mathcal{L}\mathbf{u}\rangle_{\mathbf{V}} \geq C(1-\frac{C_0h}{\sqrt{t}})\langle \mathbf{u},\mathbf{u}\rangle_{\mathbf{V}} \tag{9.4}$$

*where $\langle \mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\rangle_{\mathbf{V}} = \sum_{i=1}^n u_iv_iV_i$ for any $\mathbf{u} = (u_1,\cdots,u_n)^t, \mathbf{v} = (v_1,\cdots,v_n)^t\in\mathbb{R}^d$.*

The proof of the above theorem is deferred to Appendix D in the supplementary material.

It has an easy corollary which gives a priori estimate of $\mathbf{u} = (u_1,\cdots,u_n)^t$ solving the discrete problem (N3).

**Lemma 9.1.** *Suppose $\mathbf{u} = (u_1,\cdots,u_n)^t$ with $\sum_i u_iV_i = 0$ solves the problem* (N3) *with $b = 0$ and $\mathbf{f} = (f(\mathbf{p}_1),\cdots,f(\mathbf{p}_n))^t$ for $f\in C(\mathcal{M})$. Then there exists a constant $C>0$ such that*

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^n u_i^2V_i\right)^{1/2} \leq C\|f\|_\infty, \tag{9.5}$$

*provided $t$ and $\frac{h}{\sqrt{t}}$ are small enough.*

*Proof.* From Theorem 9.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^n u_i^2V_i \;&\leq\; \sum_{i=1}^n\left(\sum_{\mathbf{p}_j\in P}\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{p}_i,\mathbf{p}_j)f_jV_j\right)u_iV_i\\
&\leq\; \left(\sum_{i=1}^n u_i^2V_i\right)^{1/2}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n\left(\|f\|_\infty\sum_{p_j\in P}\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{p}_i,\mathbf{p}_j)V_j\right)^2V_i\right)^{1/2}\\
&\leq\; C\left(\sum_{i=1}^n u_i^2V_i\right)^{1/2}\|f\|_\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma. ∎

*Proof.* of Theorem 4.2
Denote

$$u_{t,h}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{w_{t,h}(\mathbf{x})}\left(\sum_{\mathbf{p}_j\in P} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j)u_jV_j - t\sum_{\mathbf{p}_j\in P}\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j)f_jV_j\right) \tag{9.6}$$

where $\mathbf{u}=(u_1,\cdots,u_n)^t$ with $\sum_{i=1}^n u_iV_i=0$ solves the problem (N3) with $b=0$, $f_j=f(\mathbf{p}_j)$ and $w_{t,h}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{p}_j\in P} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j)V_j$. For convenience, we set

$$a_{t,h}(\mathbf{x}) \;=\; \frac{1}{w_{t,h}(\mathbf{x})}\sum_{\mathbf{p}_j\in P} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j)u_jV_j, \quad \text{and} \tag{9.7}$$

$$c_{t,h}(\mathbf{x}) \;=\; -\frac{t}{w_{t,h}(\mathbf{x})}\sum_{\mathbf{p}_j\in P} \bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j)f(\mathbf{p}_j)V_j, \tag{9.8}$$

and thus $u_{t,h}=a_{t,h}+c_{t,h}$.

First we upper bound $\|L_t(u_{t,h})-L_{t,h}(u_{t,h})\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})}$. For $c_{t,h}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&|(L_tc_{t,h}-L_{t,h}c_{t,h})(\mathbf{x})|\\
=\;& \frac{1}{t}\left|\int_{\mathcal{M}} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})(c_{t,h}(\mathbf{x})-c_{t,h}(\mathbf{y}))\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} - \sum_{\mathbf{p}_j\in P} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j)(c_{t,h}(\mathbf{x})-c_{t,h}(\mathbf{p}_j))V_j\right|\\
\le\;& \frac{1}{t}|c_{t,h}(\mathbf{x})|\left|\int_{\mathcal{M}} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} - \sum_{\mathbf{p}_j\in P} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j)V_j\right|\\
&+\frac{1}{t}\left|\int_{\mathcal{M}} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})c_{t,h}(\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} - \sum_{\mathbf{p}_j\in P} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j)c_{t,h}(\mathbf{p}_j)V_j\right|\\
\le\;& \frac{Ch}{t^{3/2}}|c_{t,h}(\mathbf{x})| + \frac{Ch}{t^{3/2}}\|c_{t,h}\|_{C^1(\mathcal{M})}\\
\le\;& \frac{Ch}{t^{3/2}}t\|f\|_\infty + \frac{Ch}{t^{3/2}}(t\|f\|_\infty + t^{1/2}\|f\|_\infty) \le \frac{Ch}{t}\|f\|_\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

For $a_{t,h}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathcal{M}}(a_{t,h}(\mathbf{x}))^2\left|\int_{\mathcal{M}} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} - \sum_{\mathbf{p}_j\in P} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j)V_j\right|^2\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \qquad (9.9)\\
\le\;& \frac{Ch^2}{t}\int_{\mathcal{M}}(a_{t,h}(\mathbf{x}))^2\,\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \le \frac{Ch^2}{t}\int_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\frac{1}{w_{t,h}(\mathbf{x})}\sum_{\mathbf{p}_j\in P} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j)u_jV_j\right)^2\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\\
\le\;& \frac{Ch^2}{t}\int_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\sum_{\mathbf{p}_j\in P} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j)u_j^2V_j\right)\left(\sum_{\mathbf{p}_j\in P} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j)V_j\right)\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\\
\le\;& \frac{Ch^2}{t}\left(\sum_{j=1}^n u_j^2V_j\int_{\mathcal{M}} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j)\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\right) \le \frac{Ch^2}{t}\sum_{j=1}^n u_j^2V_j.
\end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned}
A \;=\;& C_t\int_{\mathcal{M}}\frac{1}{w_{t,h}(\mathbf{y})}R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right)R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{p}_i-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right)\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\\
-\;& C_t\sum_{\mathbf{p}_j\in P}\frac{1}{w_{t,h}(\mathbf{p}_j)}R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}_j|^2}{4t}\right)R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{p}_i-\mathbf{p}_j|^2}{4t}\right)V_j.
\end{aligned}$$

We have $|A| < \frac{Ch}{t^{1/2}}$ for some constant $C$ independent of $t$. In addition, notice that only when $|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}_i|^2 \leq 16t$ is $A \neq 0$, which implies

$$|A| \leq \frac{1}{\delta_0}|A| R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}_i|^2}{32t}\right).$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathcal{M}} \left| \int_{\mathcal{M}} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) a_{t,h}(\mathbf{y}) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} - \sum_{\mathbf{p}_j \in P} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j) a_{t,h}(\mathbf{p}_j) V_j \right|^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \qquad (9.10)\\
=& \int_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n C_t u_i V_i A \right)^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \leq \frac{Ch^2}{t} \int_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n C_t |u_i| V_i R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}_i|^2}{32t}\right)\right)^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\\
\leq& \frac{Ch^2}{t} \int_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n C_t R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}_i|^2}{32t}\right) u_i^2 V_i \right) \left( \sum_{\mathbf{p}_i \in P} C_t R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}_i|^2}{32t}\right) V_i \right) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\\
\leq& \frac{Ch^2}{t} \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \int_{\mathcal{M}} C_t R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}_i|^2}{32t}\right) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \left(u_i^2 V_i\right)\right) \leq \frac{Ch^2}{t} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n u_i^2 V_i \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining Equation (9.9), (9.10) and Lemma 9.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|L_t a_{t,h} - L_{t,h} a_{t,h}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})}\\
=& \left( \int_M \left| \left(L_t(a_{t,h}) - L_{t,h}(a_{t,h})\right)(\mathbf{x}) \right|^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \right)^{1/2}\\
\leq& \frac{1}{t} \left( \int_{\mathcal{M}} \left(a_{t,h}(\mathbf{x})\right)^2 \left| \int_{\mathcal{M}} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} - \sum_{\mathbf{p}_j \in P} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j) V_j \right|^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \right)^{1/2}\\
&+ \frac{1}{t} \left( \int_{\mathcal{M}} \left| \int_{\mathcal{M}} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) a_{t,h}(\mathbf{y}) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} - \sum_{\mathbf{p}_j \in P} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j) a_{t,h}(\mathbf{p}_j) V_j \right|^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \right)^{1/2}\\
\leq& \frac{Ch}{t^{3/2}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n u_i^2 V_i \right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{Ch}{t^{3/2}} \|f\|_\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Assembling the parts together, we have the following upper bound.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|L_t u_{t,h} - L_{t,h} u_{t,h}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \qquad (9.11)\\
\leq& \|L_t a_{t,h} - L_{t,h} a_{t,h}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + \|L_t c_{t,h} - L_{t,h} c_{t,h}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})}\\
\leq& \frac{Ch}{t^{3/2}} \|f\|_\infty + \frac{Ch}{t} \|f\|_\infty \leq \frac{Ch}{t^{3/2}} \|f\|_\infty
\end{aligned}$$

At the same time, since $u_t$ respectively $u_{t,h}$ solves equation (N2) respectively equation (9.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|L_t(u_t) - L_{t,h}(u_{t,h})\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \qquad (9.12)\\
=& \left( \int_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \left(L_t u_t - L_{t,h} u_{t,h}\right)(\mathbf{x}) \right)^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \right)^{1/2}\\
=& \left( \int_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \int_{\mathcal{M}} \bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) f(\mathbf{y}) - \sum_{\mathbf{p}_j \in P} \bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j) f(\mathbf{p}_j) V_j \right)^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \right)^{1/2}\\
\leq& \frac{Ch}{t^{1/2}} \|f\|_{C^1(\mathcal{M})}.
\end{aligned}$$

The complete $L^2$ estimate follows from Equation (9.11) and (9.12).

The estimate of the gradient, $\|\nabla(L_t(u_t) - L_{t,h}(u_{t,h}))\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})}$, can be obtained similarly. The details can be found in Appendix E in the supplementary material. □

# 10 Stability analysis

In this section, we will prove Theorem 4.3 and 4.6. Both theorems are concerned with the stability of $L_t$. Once we have the coercivity of $L_t$ (Theorem 4.4, 4.5), the proof of Theorem 4.3 is quite straightforward.

*Proof.* of Theorem 4.3

Using Theorem 4.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} &\leq C\langle u, L_t u\rangle = C\int_{\mathcal{M}} u(\mathbf{x})(r(\mathbf{x}) - \bar{r})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \\ &\leq C\|u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})}\|r\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})}. \end{aligned} \tag{10.1}$$

To show the last inequality, we use the fact that

$$|\bar{r}| = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}|}\left|\int_{\mathcal{M}} r(\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\right| \leq C\|r\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})}.$$

This inequality (10.1) implies that

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \leq C\|r\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})}. \tag{10.2}$$

Now we turn to estimate $\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})}$. Notice that we have the following expression for $u$,

$$u(\mathbf{x}) = v(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{t}{w_t(\mathbf{x})}\left(r(\mathbf{x}) - \bar{r}\right) \tag{10.3}$$

where

$$v(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{w_t(\mathbf{x})}\int_{\mathcal{M}} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})u(\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}, \quad w_t(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\mathcal{M}} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}. \tag{10.4}$$

By Theorem 4.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} &\leq 2\|\nabla v\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + 2t^2\left\|\nabla\left(\frac{r(\mathbf{x}) - \bar{r}}{w_t(\mathbf{x})}\right)\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \\ &\leq C\langle u, L_t u\rangle + Ct\|r\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + Ct^2\|\nabla r\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \\ &\leq C\|u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})}\|r\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + Ct\|r\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + Ct^2\|\nabla r\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \\ &\leq C\|r\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + Ct^2\|\nabla r\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \\ &\leq C\left(\|r\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + t\|\nabla r\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})}\right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

The proof of Theorem 4.6 is more involved.

*Proof. of Theorem 4.6*

The key point is to show that

$$\left|\int_{\mathcal{M}} u(\mathbf{x})\left(r(\mathbf{x}) - \bar{r}\right)\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\right| \leq C\sqrt{t}\max_i\left(\|b^i\|_\infty\right)\|u\|_{H^1(\mathcal{M})}. \tag{10.5}$$

Notice that

$$|\bar{r}| = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}|}\left|\int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} b^i(\mathbf{y})\eta^i(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{y}}\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}\right| \leq C\sqrt{t}\ \max_i\left(\|b^i\|_\infty\right).$$

Then it is sufficient to show that

$$\left|\int_{\mathcal{M}} u(\mathbf{x})\left(\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} b^i(\mathbf{y})\eta^i\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{y}}\right)\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\right| \leq C\sqrt{t}\ \max_i\left(\|b^i\|_\infty\right)\|u\|_{H^1(\mathcal{M})}. \tag{10.6}$$

Similar to the inequality (8.5), we have

$$|2t\nabla^i\bar{\bar{R}}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) - \eta^i\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})| \leq C|\xi|^2\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}), \tag{10.7}$$

where $\bar{\bar{R}}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) = C_t\bar{\bar{R}}\left(\frac{\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}\|^2}{4t}\right)$ and $\bar{\bar{R}}(r) = \int_r^\infty \bar{R}(s)\mathrm{d}s$, which gives us that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\int_{\mathcal{M}} u(\mathbf{x})\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} b^i(\mathbf{y})\left(\eta^i\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) + 2t\nabla_i\bar{\bar{R}}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\right)\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{y}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\right| \qquad (10.8)\\
\leq\ & C\int_{\mathcal{M}}|u(\mathbf{x})|\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}}|b^i(\mathbf{y})||\xi|^2\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{y}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\\
\leq\ & Ct\max_i\left(\|b^i\|_\infty\right)\int_{\mathcal{M}}|u(\mathbf{x})|\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}}\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{y}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\\
\leq\ & Ct\max_i\left(\|b^i\|_\infty\right)\left(\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}}\left(\int_{\mathcal{M}}\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\right)\left(\int_{\mathcal{M}}|u(\mathbf{x})|^2\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\right)\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{y}}\right)^{1/2}\\
\leq\ & Ct\max_i\left(\|b^i\|_\infty\right)\left(\int_{\mathcal{M}}|u(\mathbf{x})|^2\left(\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}}\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{y}}\right)\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\right)^{1/2}\\
\leq\ & Ct^{3/4}\max_i\left(\|b^i\|_\infty\right)\|u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})}.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, using the Gauss integral formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathcal{M}} u(\mathbf{x})\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} b^i(\mathbf{y})\nabla_i\bar{\bar{R}}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{y}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \qquad (10.9)\\
=\ & \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} u(\mathbf{x})\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{y}))\cdot\nabla\bar{\bar{R}}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{y}}\\
=\ & \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}}\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}}\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x})\cdot\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{y}))u(\mathbf{x})\bar{\bar{R}}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{x}}\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{y}}\\
&-\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}}\mathrm{div}_{\mathbf{x}}[u(\mathbf{x})\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{y}))]\bar{\bar{R}}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{y}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}}$ is the projection operator to the tangent space on $\mathbf{x}$. To get the first equality, we use the fact that $\nabla\bar{\bar{R}}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ belongs to the tangent space on $\mathbf{x}$, such that $b^i(\mathbf{y})\nabla_i\bar{\bar{R}}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) = \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{y}))\cdot\nabla\bar{\bar{R}}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$.

For the first term, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}}\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}}\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x})\cdot\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{y}))u(\mathbf{x})\bar{\bar{R}}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{x}}\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{y}}\right| \qquad (10.10)\\
\leq\ & C\max_i\left(\|b^i\|_\infty\right)\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}}\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}}|u(\mathbf{x})|\bar{\bar{R}}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{x}}\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{y}}\\
\leq\ & C\max_i\left(\|b^i\|_\infty\right)\left(\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}}\left(\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}}|u(\mathbf{x})|\bar{\bar{R}}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{x}}\right)^2\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{y}}\right)^{1/2}\\
\leq\ & C\max_i\left(\|b^i\|_\infty\right)\left(\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}}\left(\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}}\bar{\bar{R}}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{x}}\right)\left(\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}}|u(\mathbf{x})|^2\bar{\bar{R}}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{x}}\right)\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{y}}\right)^{1/2}\\
\leq\ & Ct^{-1/2}\ \max_i\left(\|b^i\|_\infty\right)\|u\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{M})} \leq Ct^{-1/2}\ \max_i\left(\|b^i\|_\infty\right)\|u\|_{H^1(\mathcal{M})}.
\end{aligned}$$

We can also bound the second term on the right hand side of (10.9). By using the assumption that $\mathcal{M} \in C^\infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathrm{div}_{\mathbf{x}}[u(\mathbf{x})\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{y}))]| &\le |\nabla u(\mathbf{x})||\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{y}))| + |u(\mathbf{x})||\mathrm{div}_{\mathbf{x}}[\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{y}))]| \\ &\le C(|\nabla u(\mathbf{x})| + |u(\mathbf{x})|)|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})| \\ &\le C \max_i \left(\|b^i\|_\infty\right)(|\nabla u(\mathbf{x})| + |u(\mathbf{x})|) \end{aligned}$$

where the constant $C$ depends on the curvature of the manifold $\mathcal{M}$.

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left|\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} \mathrm{div}_{\mathbf{x}}[u(\mathbf{x})\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{y}))]\bar{\bar{R}}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{y}}\right| \qquad (10.11)\\ \le\ & C\max_i\left(\|b^i\|_\infty\right)\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}}(|\nabla u(\mathbf{x})| + |u(\mathbf{x})|)\bar{\bar{R}}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{y}} \\ \le\ & C\max_i\left(\|b^i\|_\infty\right)\left(\int_{\mathcal{M}}(|\nabla u(\mathbf{x})|^2 + |u(\mathbf{x})|^2)\left(\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}}\bar{\bar{R}}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{y}}\right)\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\right)^{1/2} \\ \le\ & Ct^{-1/4}\max_i\left(\|b^i\|_\infty\right)\|u\|_{H^1(\mathcal{M})}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the inequality (10.6) is obtained from (10.8), (10.9), (10.10) and (10.11). Now, using Theorem 4.5, we have

$$\|u\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \le C\langle u, L_t u\rangle \le C\sqrt{t}\max_i\left(\|b^i\|_\infty\right)\|u\|_{H^1(\mathcal{M})}. \qquad (10.12)$$

Note $r(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} b^i(\mathbf{y})\eta^i\bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\tau_{\mathbf{y}}$. A direct calculation gives us that

$$\|r(\mathbf{x})\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \le Ct^{1/4}\max_i\left(\|b^i\|_\infty\right), \text{ and} \qquad (10.13)$$

$$\|\nabla r(\mathbf{x})\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \le Ct^{-1/4}\max_i\left(\|b^i\|_\infty\right). \qquad (10.14)$$

The integral equation $-L_t u = r - \bar{r}$ gives that

$$u(\mathbf{x}) = v(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{t}{w_t(\mathbf{x})}(r(\mathbf{x}) - \bar{r}) \qquad (10.15)$$

where

$$v(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{w_t(\mathbf{x})}\int_{\mathcal{M}} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})u(\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}, \quad w_t(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\mathcal{M}} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}. \qquad (10.16)$$

By Theorem 4.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \qquad (10.17)\\ \le\ & 2\|\nabla v\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + 2t^2\left\|\nabla\left(\frac{r(\mathbf{x})-\bar{r}}{w_t(\mathbf{x})}\right)\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \\ \le\ & C\langle u, L_t u\rangle + Ct\|r\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + Ct^2\|\nabla r\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \\ \le\ & C\sqrt{t}\max_i\left(\|b^i\|_\infty\right)\|u\|_{H^1(\mathcal{M})} + Ct\|r\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + Ct^2\|\nabla r\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \\ \le\ & C\max_i\left(\|b^i\|_\infty\right)\left(\sqrt{t}\|u\|_{H^1(\mathcal{M})} + Ct^{3/2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Using (10.12) and (10.17), we have

$$\|u\|^2_{H^1(\mathcal{M})} \le C\max_i\left(\|b^i\|_\infty\right)\left(\sqrt{t}\|u\|_{H^1(\mathcal{M})} + Ct^{3/2}\right), \qquad (10.18)$$

which proves the theorem. □

**Acknowledgments.** This research was partial supported by NSFC Grant (11201257 to Z.S., 11371220 to Z.S. and J.S. and 11271011 to J.S.).

## References


[1] D. Adalsteinsson and J. A. Sethian. Transport and diffusion of material quantities on propagating interfaces via level set methods. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 185:271–288, 2003.

[2] R. Barreira, C. Elliott, and A. Madzvamuse. Modelling and simulations of multi-component lipid membranes and open membranes via diffuse interface approaches. *J. Math. Biol.*, 56:347–371, 2008.

[3] R. Barreira, C. Elliott, and A. Madzvamuse. The surface finite element method for pattern formation on evolving biological surfaces. *J. Math. Biol.*, 63:1095–1119, 2011.

[4] M. Belkin and P. Niyogi. Laplacian eigenmaps for dimensionality reduction and data representation. *Neural Computation*, 15(6):1373–1396, 2003.

[5] M. Belkin and P. Niyogi. Towards a theoretical foundation for laplacian-based manifold methods. In *COLT*, pages 486–500, 2005.

[6] M. Belkin and P. Niyogi. Convergence of laplacian eigenmaps. *preprint, short version NIPS 2008*, 2008.

[7] M. Belkin, Q. Que, Y. Wang, and X. Zhou. Toward understanding complex spaces: Graph laplacians on manifolds with singularities and boundaries. In S. Mannor, N. Srebro, and R. C. Williamson, editors, *COLT*, volume 23 of *JMLR Proceedings*, pages 36.1–36.26. JMLR.org, 2012.

[8] M. Belkin, J. Sun, and Y. Wang. Constructing laplace operator from point clouds in rd. In *SODA '09: Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual ACM -SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1031–1040, Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2009. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.

[9] D. Boffi. Finite element approximation of eigenvalue problems. *Acta Numerica*, 19:1–120, 5 2010.

[10] J.-D. Boissonnat, R. Dyer, and A. Ghosh. Stability of delaunay-type structures for manifolds: [extended abstract]. In T. K. Dey and S. Whitesides, editors, *Symposium on Computational Geometry*, pages 229–238. ACM, 2012.

[11] J. W. Cahn, P. Fife, and O. Penrose. A phase-field model for diffusion-induced grain-boundary motion. *Ann. Statist.*, 36(2):555–586, 2008.

[12] S.-W. Cheng, T. K. Dey, and J. R. Shewchuk. *Delaunay Mesh Generation*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida, December 2012.

[13] F. R. K. Chung. *Spectral Graph Theory*. American Mathematical Society, 1997.

[14] R. R. Coifman, S. Lafon, A. B. Lee, M. Maggioni, F. Warner, and S. Zucker. Geometric diffusions as a tool for harmonic analysis and structure definition of data: Diffusion maps. In *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, pages 7426–7431, 2005.

[15] T. K. Dey, J. Sun, and Y. Wang. Approximating cycles in a shortest basis of the first homology group from point data. *Inverse Problems*, 27(12):124004, 2011.

[16] J. Dodziuk and V. K. Patodi. Riemannian structures and triangulations of manifolds. *Journal of Indian Math. Soc.*, 40:1–52, 1976.

[17] Q. Du, M. Gunzburger, R. B. Lehoucq, and K. Zhou. Analysis and approximation of nonlocal diffusion problems with volume constraints. *SIAM Review*, 54:667–696, 2012.

[18] G. Dziuk. Finite elements for the beltrami operator on arbitrary surfaces. In S. Hildebrandt and R. Leis, editors, *Partial differential equations and calculus of variations*, volume 1357 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 142–155. Springer, 1988.

[19] G. Dziuk and C. M. Elliott. Finite element methods for surface pdes. *Acta Numerica*, 22:289–396, 2013.

[20] C. Eilks and C. M. Elliott. Numerical simulation of dealloying by surface dissolution via the evolving surface finite element method. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 227:9727–9741, 2008.

[21] C. M. Elliott and B. Stinner. Modeling and computation of two phase geometric biomem- branes using surface finite elements. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 229:6585–6612, 2010.

[22] C. M. Elliott, B. Stinner, V. Styles, and R. Welford. Numerical computation of advection and diffusion on evolving diffuse interfaces. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 31:786–812, 2011.

[23] S. Ganesan and L. Tobiska. A coupled arbitrary lagrangian eulerian and lagrangian method for computation of free-surface flows with insoluble surfactants. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 228:2859–2873, 2009.

[24] M. Hein, J.-Y. Audibert, and U. von Luxburg. From graphs to manifolds - weak and strong pointwise consistency of graph laplacians. In *Proceedings of the 18th Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, COLT'05, pages 470–485, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2005. Springer-Verlag.

[25] A. J. James and J. Lowengrub. A surfactant-conserving volume-of-fluid method for interfacial flows with insoluble surfactant. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 201:685–722, 2004.

[26] S. Lafon. *Diffusion Maps and Geodesic Harmonics*. PhD thesis, 2004.

[27] R. Lai, J. Liang, and H. Zhao. A local mesh method for solving pdes on point clouds. *Inverse Problem and Imaging*, to appear.

[28] M. Lenz, S. F. Nemadjieu, and M. Rumpf. A convergent finite volume scheme for diffusion on evolving surfaces. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 49:15–37, 2011.

[29] Z. Li, Z. Shi, and J. Sun. Finite integral method for solving poisson-type equations on manifolds from point clouds with convergence guarantees. *arXiv:1409.2623*.

[30] J. Liang and H. Zhao. Solving partial differential equations on point clouds. *SIAM Journal of Scientific Computing*, 35:1461–1486, 2013.

[31] C. Luo, J. Sun, and Y. Wang. Integral estimation from point cloud in d-dimensional space: a geometric view. In *Symposium on Computational Geometry*, pages 116–124, 2009.

[32] M. P. Neilson, J. A. Mackenzie, S. D. Webb, and R. H. Insall. Modelling cell movement and chemotaxis using pseudopod-based feedback. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 33:1035–1057, 2011.

[33] P. Niyogi, S. Smale, and S. Weinberger. Finding the homology of submanifolds with high confidence from random samples. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 39(1-3):419–441, 2008.

[34] S. Rosenberg. *The Laplacian on a Riemannian Manifold: An Introduction to Analysis on Manifolds*. Cambridge University Press, 1997.

[35] J. R. Shewchuk. What is a good linear finite element? interpolation, conditioning, anisotropy, and quality measures. *preprint*, 2002.

[36] A. Singer. From graph to manifold Laplacian: The convergence rate. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 21(1):128–134, July 2006.

[37] A. Singer and H. tieng Wu. Spectral convergence of the connection laplacian from random samples. *arXiv:1306.1587*.

[38] G. Strang and G. J. Fix. *An analysis of the finite element method*. Prentice-Hall, 1973.

[39] M. Wardetzky. *Discrete Differential Operators on Polyhedral Surfaces - Convergence and Approximation.* PhD thesis, 2006.

[40] J. J. Xu and H. K. Zhao. An eulerian formulation for solving partial differential equations along a moving interface. *J. Sci. Comput.*, 19:573–594, 2003.

# A Proof of Proposition 6.1

To prove the proposition, we first cite a few results from Riemannian geometry on isometric embeddings. For a submanifold $\mathcal{M}$ embedded in $\mathbb{R}^d$, let $d_{\mathcal{M}} : \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}$ be the geodesic distance on $\mathcal{M}$, and $T_p\mathcal{M}$ and $N_p\mathcal{M}$ be the tangent space and the normal space of $\mathcal{M}$ at point $p \in \mathcal{M}$ respectively.

**Lemma A.1.** *(eg [15]) Assume $\mathcal{M}$ is a submanifold isometrically embedded in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with reach $r > 0$. For any two $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$ on $\mathcal{M}$ with $|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| \leq r/2$,*

$$|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| \leq d_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|(1 + \frac{2|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^2}{r^2}).$$

**Lemma A.2.** *(eg [8]) Assume $\mathcal{M}$ is a submanifold isometrically embedded in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with reach $r > 0$. For any two $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$ on $\mathcal{M}$ with $|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| \leq r/2$,*

$$\cos \angle T_{\mathbf{x}}\mathcal{M}, T_{\mathbf{y}}\mathcal{M} \leq 1 - \frac{2|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^2}{r^2}.$$

**Lemma A.3.** *(eg [33]) Assume $\mathcal{M}$ is a submanifold isometrically embedded in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with reach $r > 0$. Let $N$ be any local normal vector field around a point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}$. Then for any tangent vector $Y \in T_{\mathbf{x}}\mathcal{M}$*

$$\frac{< Y, D_Y N >}{< Y, Y >} \leq \frac{1}{r}$$

*where $D$ and $< \cdot, \cdot >$ are the standard connection and the standard inner product in $\mathbb{R}^d$.*

In what follows, assume the hypotheses on $\mathcal{M}$ and $\partial\mathcal{M}$ in Proposition 6.1 hold. We prove the following two lemmas which bound the distortion of certain parametrization, which are used to build the parametrization stated in Proposition 6.1.

For a point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M},$, let $U_\rho = B_{\mathbf{x}}(\rho r) \cap \mathcal{M}$ with $\rho \leq 0.2$. We define the following projection map $\Psi : U_\rho \to T_{\mathbf{x}}\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}^k$ as the restriction to $U_\rho$ of the projection of $\mathbb{R}^d$ onto $T_{\mathbf{x}}\mathcal{M}$. It is easy to verify that $\Psi$ is one-to-one. Then $\Phi = \Psi^{-1} : \Psi(U_\rho) \to U_\rho$ is a parametrization of $U_\rho$. See Figure 1. We have the following lemma which bounds the distortion of this parametrization.

**Lemma A.4.** *For any point $\mathbf{y} \in \Psi(U_\rho)$ and any $Y \in T_{\mathbf{y}}(T_{\mathbf{x}}\mathcal{M})$ for any $\rho \leq 0.2$,*

$$|Y| \leq |D_Y \Phi(\mathbf{y})| \leq \frac{1}{1 - 2\rho^2}|Y|.$$

*Proof.* We have $\Phi(\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{y} - l_T(\mathbf{y})N_T(\mathbf{y})$ where $N_T(\mathbf{y}) \perp T_{\mathbf{x}}\mathcal{M}$ for any $\mathbf{y}$ and $l_T(\mathbf{y}) = |\mathbf{y} - \Phi(\mathbf{y})|$. So $D_Y N_T(\mathbf{y}) \perp T_{\mathbf{x}}\mathcal{M}$ for any $\mathbf{y}$ and any $Y \in T_{\mathbf{y}}(T_{\mathbf{x}}\mathcal{M})$. Since $D_Y\Phi = Y - N_T\,(D_Y l_T) - l_T\,(D_Y N_T)$, the projection of $D_Y\Phi$ to $T_{\mathbf{x}}\mathcal{M}$ is $Y$. At the same time, $D_Y\Phi$ is on $T_{\Phi(\mathbf{y})}\mathcal{M}$. Since $|\mathbf{x} - \Phi(\mathbf{y})| \leq \rho r$, from Lemma A.2, $\cos \angle T_{\mathbf{x}}\mathcal{M}, T_{\Phi(\mathbf{y})}\mathcal{M} \leq 1 - 2\rho^2$. This proves the lemma. □




Figure 1: Parametrization for a neighborhood of a point on $\mathcal{M}$.




Figure 2: Parametrization for a neighborhood of a point on $\partial\mathcal{M}$

To ensure the convexity of the parameter domain $\Omega$ in Proposition 6.1, We need a different parametrization for the points near the boundary. For a point $\mathbf{x} \in \partial\mathcal{M}$, let $U_\rho = B_{\mathbf{x}}(\rho r) \cap \mathcal{M}$ with $\rho \leq 0.1$. We construct a map $\tilde{\Psi} : U_\rho \to T_{\mathbf{x}}\partial\mathcal{M} \times \mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R}^k$ as follows. For any point $\mathbf{z} \in U_\rho$, let $\bar{\mathbf{z}}$ be the closest point on $\partial\mathcal{M}$ to $\mathbf{z}$. Such $\bar{\mathbf{z}}$ is unique. Let $\mathbf{n}$ be the outward normal of $\partial\mathcal{M}$ at $\bar{\mathbf{z}}$. The projection $P$ of $\mathbb{R}^d$ onto $T_{\bar{\mathbf{z}}}\mathcal{M}$ maps $\mathbf{z}$ to a point on the line $\ell$ passing through $\bar{\mathbf{z}}$ with the direction $\mathbf{n}$. In fact, $P$ projects $N_{\bar{\mathbf{z}}}\partial\mathcal{M}$ onto the line $\ell$. If let $V_{\rho_1} = N_{\bar{\mathbf{z}}}\partial\mathcal{M} \cap B_{\bar{\mathbf{z}}}(\rho_1 r) \cap \mathcal{M}$ with $\rho_1 \leq 0.2$, $P$ maps $V_{\rho_1}$ to the line $\ell$ in the one-to-one manner. Let $y^k = -(P(\mathbf{z}) - \bar{\mathbf{z}}) \cdot \mathbf{n}$. Think of $\partial\mathcal{M}$ as a submanifold. It is isometrically embedded in $\mathbb{R}^d$ as is $\mathcal{M}$. As $|\bar{\mathbf{z}} - \mathbf{x}| \leq 2|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}| \leq 2\rho r$, we apply Lemma A.4 by replacing $\mathcal{M}$ with $\partial\mathcal{M}$ and obtain the map $\Psi$ that maps $\bar{\mathbf{z}}$ onto $T_{\mathbf{x}}\partial\mathcal{M}$. Define $\tilde{\Psi}(\mathbf{z}) = (\Psi(\bar{\mathbf{z}}), y^k)$. Since both $P|_{V_{\rho_1}}$ and $\Psi$ are one-to-one, so is $\tilde{\Psi}$. Then $\tilde{\Phi} = \tilde{\Psi}^{-1} : \tilde{\Psi}(U_\rho) \to U_\rho$ is a parametrization of $U_\rho$. See Figure 2. We have the following lemma which bounds the distortion of this parametrization $\tilde{\Phi}$.

**Lemma A.5.** *For any point $(\mathbf{y}, y^k) \in \tilde{\Psi}(U_\rho)$ with $\rho \leq 0.1$ and any tangent vector $Y$ at $(\mathbf{y}, y^k)$,*

$$(1 - 2\rho)|Y| \leq |D_Y\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{y}, y^k)| \leq (1 + 2\rho)|Y|.$$

*Proof.* Let $\bar{\mathbf{y}} = \Phi(\mathbf{y}) - y^k\mathbf{n}$. We have $\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{y}, y^k) = \Phi(\mathbf{y}) - y^k\mathbf{n}(\Phi(\mathbf{y})) - l_T(\bar{\mathbf{y}})N_T(\bar{\mathbf{y}})$ where $N_T(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) \perp T_{\Phi(\mathbf{y})}\mathcal{M}$. See Figure 2. We have

$$D_Y\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{y}, y^k) = D_Y\Phi - y^k D_Y\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{n}D_Y y^k - N_T D_Y l_T - l_T D_Y N_t.$$

Using the similar strategy of proving Lemma A.4, we consider the projection of $D_Y\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{y}, y^k)$ to the space $T_\Phi(\mathbf{y})M$ to which it is almost parallel. Denote $P$ this projection map . We bound $P(D_Y\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{y}, y^k))$. Let

$Y = (Y^1, \cdots, Y^k)$, $Y_1 = (Y^1, \cdots, Y^{k-1}, 0)$ and $Y_2 = (0, \cdots, 0, Y^k)$. We have $D_Y\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{y}, y^k) = D_{Y_1}\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{y}, y^k) + D_{Y_2}\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{y}, y^k)$. First consider each term involved in $D_{Y_1}\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{y}, y^k)$.

(i) $D_{Y_1}\Phi(\mathbf{y})$ is a vector in $T_{\Phi(\mathbf{y})}\partial\mathcal{M}$, thus $P(D_{Y_1}\Phi(\mathbf{y})) = D_{Y_1}\Phi(\mathbf{y})$. In addition, from Lemma A.4, $|Y_1| \le |D_{Y_1}\Phi(\mathbf{y})| \le \frac{1}{1-2\rho^2}|Y_1|$.

(ii) $D_{Y_1}\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{y}, y^k) = D_{D_{Y_1}\Phi}\mathbf{n}(\Phi(\mathbf{y}))$. First note that $\mathbf{n} \cdot D_{D_{Y_1}\Phi}\mathbf{n} = 0$. Second, from Lemma A.3, we have that the projection of $D_{D_{Y_1}\Phi}\mathbf{n}$ to the space $T_{\Phi(\mathbf{y})}\partial\mathcal{M}$ is upper bounded by $\frac{1}{r}|D_{Y_1}\Phi|$. Since $|y^k| < \rho r$, $|P(y^k D_{Y_1}\mathbf{n})| \le \frac{\rho}{1-2\rho^2}|Y_1|$.

(iii) Consider $D_{Y_1}N_T(\mathbf{y}, y^k)$. We have $N_T \perp T_{\Phi(\mathbf{y})}\mathcal{M}$. Let $e_1, \cdots, e_k$ be the orthonormal basis of $T_{\Phi(\mathbf{y})}\mathcal{M}$ so that $D_{e_i}N_T \cdot e_j = 0$ for $i \neq j$. Locally extend $e_1, \cdots, e_k$ to be an orthonormal basis of $T\mathcal{M}$ in a neighborhood of $\Phi(\mathbf{y})$. We have for any $e_i$

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|D_{Y_1}N_T(\mathbf{y}, y^k) \cdot e_i\right| &= \left|D_{D_{Y_1}\Phi}N_T(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) \cdot e_i\right| \\
&= \left|D_{(D_{Y_1}\Phi \cdot e_i)e_i}N_T(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) \cdot e_i\right| \\
&= \left|D_{(D_{Y_1}\Phi \cdot e_i)e_i}N_T(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) \cdot e_i\right| \\
&\le \frac{1}{r}|D_{Y_1}\Phi \cdot e_i|
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to Lemma A.3. Moreover, one can verify that $l_T(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) \le \frac{\rho^2 r}{2}$, which leads to

$$|P(l_T D_{Y_1}N_t)| \le \frac{\rho^2}{2}|D_{Y_1}\Phi| \le \frac{\rho^2}{2(1-2\rho^2)}|Y_1|$$

(iv) It is obvious that $\mathbf{n}D_{Y_1}y^k = P(N_T D_{Y_1}l_T) = 0$.

Next consider each term involved in $D_{Y_2}\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{y}, y^k)$.

(i) $\mathbf{n}D_{Y_2}y^k = Y^k\mathbf{n}$, which lies on $T_{\Phi(\mathbf{y})}\mathcal{M}$. Moreover $\mathbf{n} \perp D_{Y_1}\Phi(\mathbf{y})$.

(ii) As $N_T(\mathbf{y}, y^k)$ remains perpendicular to $T_{\Phi(\mathbf{y})}\mathcal{M}$ if we only vary $y^k$, we have

$$P(D_{Y_2}N_t(\mathbf{y}, y^k)) = 0.$$

(iii) For the remaining terms, we have $D_{Y_2}\Phi(\mathbf{y}) = y^k D_{Y_2}\mathbf{n} = P(N_T D_{Y_2}l_T) = 0$.

On the other hand, we hand $D_Y\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{y}, y^k)$ lie in the tangent space $T_{\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{y}, y^k)}\mathcal{M}$, and

$$\cos\angle T_{\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{y}, y^k)}\mathcal{M}, T_{\Phi(\mathbf{y})}\mathcal{M} \le 1 - 2\rho^2.$$

Putting everything together, we have

$$|Y| - \frac{\rho^2 + 2\rho}{2(1-2\rho^2)}|Y_1| \le D_Y\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{y}, y^k) \le \frac{1}{(1-2\rho^2)^2}|Y| + \frac{\rho^2 + 2\rho}{2(1-2\rho^2)^2}|Y_1|.$$

This proves the lemma. □

Now we are ready to prove Proposition 6.1

*Proof.* of Proposition 6.1
First consider the case where $d(\mathbf{x}, \partial\mathcal{M}) > \frac{\rho}{2}r$. Set $U' = B_{\mathbf{x}}(\frac{\rho}{2}r) \cap \mathcal{M}$, and parametrize $U'$ using map $\Phi : \Psi(U') \to U'$. Since for any $\mathbf{y} \in \partial U'$, $|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| = \frac{\rho}{2}r$, from Lemma A.4, we have that $B_{\Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{x})}(\frac{\rho}{2(1+\rho)}r)$ is contained in $\Psi(U')$. Set $\Omega = B_{\Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{x})}(\frac{\rho}{2(1+\rho)}r)$ and $U = \Phi(\Omega)$. This shows the parametrization $\Phi : \Omega \to U$

satisfies the condition (i). By Lemma A.4 and Lemma A.1, it is easy to verify that $\Phi$ satisfies the other three conditions.

Next consider the case where $d(\mathbf{x}, \partial\mathcal{M}) \leq \frac{\rho}{2}r$. Let $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ be the closest point on $\partial\mathcal{M}$ to $\mathbf{x}$. Set $U' = B_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}(\rho r) \cap \mathcal{M}$ and parametrize $U'$ using map $\tilde{\Phi} : \tilde{\Psi}(U') \to U'$. By Lemma A.5, $\tilde{\Psi}(U')$ contains half of the ball $B_{\tilde{\Phi}^{-1}(\bar{\mathbf{x}})}(\frac{\rho}{1+2\rho}r)$. Let $\Omega$ be that half ball and $U = \tilde{\Phi}(\Omega)$. It is easy to verify that the parametrization $\tilde{\Phi} : \Omega \to U$ satisfies the condition (iii) and (iv). To see (i), note that $|\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}| \leq \frac{\rho}{2}r$. From Lemma A.5 and Lemma A.1, $\left|\tilde{\Psi}(\mathbf{x}) - \tilde{\Psi}(\bar{\mathbf{x}})\right| \leq (1+2\rho)(1+2\rho^2)|\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}|$. We have that $\Omega$ contains at least half of the ball centered at $\Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{x})$ with radius $(\frac{\rho}{1+2\rho} - \frac{\rho(1+2\rho)(1+2\rho^2)}{2})r \geq \frac{\rho}{5}r$. This shows that $\tilde{\Phi}$ satisfies the condition (i). Similarly, the condition (ii) follows from (i) as $\tilde{\Phi}$ has bounded distortion (Lemma A.5) and geodesic distance is bounded by Euclidean distance (Lemma A.1). □

# B Proof of Lemma 7.1

*Proof.* We start with the evaluation of the $x^i$ component of $\nabla v$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla^i v(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{C_t^2}{2tw_t^2(\mathbf{x})}\int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} \nabla^i x^j (x^j - y^j) R'\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right) R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}'|^2}{4t}\right) u(\mathbf{y}) \mathrm{d}\mu'_{\mathbf{y}} \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \\
&\quad - \frac{C_t^2}{2tw_t^2(\mathbf{x})}\int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} \nabla^i x^j (x^j - y'^j) R'\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}'|^2}{4t}\right) R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right) u(\mathbf{y}) \mathrm{d}\mu'_{\mathbf{y}} \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \\
&= \frac{C_t^2}{4tw_t^2(\mathbf{x})}\int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} K^i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}'; t)(u(\mathbf{y}) - u(\mathbf{y}')) \mathrm{d}\mu'_{\mathbf{y}} \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}
\end{aligned}$$

where we set

$$\begin{aligned}
K^i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}'; t) = \nabla^i x^j (x^j - y^j) R'\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right) R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}'|^2}{4t}\right) \\
- \nabla^i x^j (x^j - y'^j) R'\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}'|^2}{4t}\right) R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Think of $\nabla^i x^j$ as the $i, j$ entry of the matrix $[\nabla^i x^j]$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla^i x^j \nabla^l x^i &= (\partial_{i'} x^i) g^{i'j'} (\partial_{j'} x^j)(\partial_{s'} x^l) g^{s't'} (\partial_{t'} x^i) \\
&= g_{i't'} g^{i'j'} (\partial_{j'} x^j) g^{s't'} (\partial_{s'} x^l) \\
&= \delta_{j't'} (\partial_{j'} x^j) g^{s't'} (\partial_{s'} x^l) \\
&= (\partial_{j'} x^j) g^{s'j'} (\partial_{s'} x^l) \\
&= \nabla^l x^j.
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that the matrix $[\nabla^i x^j]$ is idempotent. At the same time, $[\nabla^i x^j]$ is symmetric, which implies that the eigenvalues of $\nabla\mathbf{x}$ are either 1 or 0. Then we have the following upper bounds. There exists a constant

$C$ depending only on the maximum of $R$ and $R'$ so that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i=1}^{d} K^i(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{y}';t)^2 \\
\leq\ & 2\left(R'\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right)R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}'|^2}{4t}\right)\right)^2 \|[\nabla^i x^j](\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})\|^2 \\
+\ & 2\left(R'\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}'|^2}{4t}\right)R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right)\right)^2 \|[\nabla^i x^j](\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}')\|^2 \\
\leq\ & CR'\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right)R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}'|^2}{4t}\right)\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}\|^2 \\
+\ & CR'\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}'|^2}{4t}\right)R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right)\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}'\|^2
\end{aligned}$$

Thus by Corollary 6.2, there exists a constant $C$ independent of $t$ so that

$$\begin{aligned}
&C_t^2\int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}}\frac{\sum_{i=1}^d K^i(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{y}';t)^2}{t}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\mathrm{d}\mu'_{\mathbf{y}} \\
\leq\ & C\int_{\mathcal{M}} C_t R'\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right)\frac{\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}\|^2}{t}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} C_t R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}'|^2}{4t}\right)\mathrm{d}\mu'_{\mathbf{y}} \\
+\ & C\int_{\mathcal{M}} C_t R'\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}'|^2}{4t}\right)\frac{\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}'\|^2}{t}\mathrm{d}\mu'_{\mathbf{y}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} C_t R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right)\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \\
\leq\ & C
\end{aligned}$$

Since $R$ has a compact support, only when $|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{y}'|^2 < 16t$ and $|\mathbf{x}-\frac{\mathbf{y}+\mathbf{y}'}{2}|^2 < 4t$ is $K^i(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{y}';t) \neq 0$. Thus from the assumption on $R$, we have

$$K^i(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{y}';t)^2 \leq \frac{1}{\delta_0^2}K^i(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{y}';t)^2 R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{y}'|^2}{32t}\right)R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\frac{\mathbf{y}+\mathbf{y}'}{2}|^2}{8t}\right).$$

We can upper bound the norm of $\nabla v$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\nabla v(\mathbf{x})|^2 = \frac{C_t^4}{16t^2 w_t^4(\mathbf{x})}\sum_{i=1}^d\left(\int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} K^i(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{y}';t)(u(\mathbf{y})-u(\mathbf{y}'))\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}'\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}\right)^2 \\
\leq\ & \frac{C_t^4}{16t^2 w_t^4(\mathbf{x})}\sum_{i=1}^k\int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} K_i^2(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{y}';t)\left(R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{y}'|^2}{32t}\right)R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\frac{\mathbf{y}+\mathbf{y}'}{2}|^2}{8t}\right)\right)^{-1}\mathrm{d}\mu'_{\mathbf{y}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \\
&\int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\frac{\mathbf{y}+\mathbf{y}'}{2}|^2}{8t}\right)R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{y}'|^2}{32t}\right)(u(\mathbf{y})-u(\mathbf{y}'))^2\mathrm{d}\mu'_{\mathbf{y}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \\
=\ & \frac{C_t^4}{16t\delta_0^2 w_t^4(\mathbf{x})}\int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}}\frac{\sum_{i=1}^d K^i(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{y}';t)^2}{t}\mathrm{d}\mu'_{\mathbf{y}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \\
&\int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\frac{\mathbf{y}+\mathbf{y}'}{2}|^2}{8t}\right)R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{y}'|^2}{32t}\right)(u(\mathbf{y})-u(\mathbf{y}'))^2\mathrm{d}\mu'_{\mathbf{y}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \\
\leq\ & \frac{CC_t^2}{t}\int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\frac{\mathbf{y}+\mathbf{y}'}{2}|^2}{8t}\right)R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{y}'|^2}{32t}\right)(u(\mathbf{y})-u(\mathbf{y}'))^2\mathrm{d}\mu'_{\mathbf{y}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathcal{M}} |\nabla v(\mathbf{x})|^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \\
\leq\ & \frac{CC_t^2}{t} \int_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \int_{\mathcal{M}} \int_{\mathcal{M}} R\left( \frac{|\mathbf{x} - \frac{\mathbf{y}+\mathbf{y}'}{2}|^2}{8t} \right) R\left( \frac{|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{y}'|^2}{32t} \right) (u(\mathbf{y}) - u(\mathbf{y}'))^2 \mathrm{d}\mu'_{\mathbf{y}} \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \right) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \\
=\ & \frac{CC_t^2}{t} \int_{\mathcal{M}} \int_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \int_{\mathcal{M}} R\left( \frac{|\mathbf{x} - \frac{\mathbf{y}+\mathbf{y}'}{2}|^2}{8t} \right) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \right) R\left( \frac{|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{y}'|^2}{32t} \right) (u(\mathbf{y}) - u(\mathbf{y}'))^2 \mathrm{d}\mu'_{\mathbf{y}} \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \\
\leq\ & \frac{CC_t}{t} \int_{\mathcal{M}} \int_{\mathcal{M}} R\left( \frac{|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{y}'|^2}{32t} \right) (u(\mathbf{y}) - u(\mathbf{y}'))^2 \mathrm{d}\mu'_{\mathbf{y}} \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the Lemma. □

# C Proof of Lemma 7.2

*Proof.* First, denote

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{x}}^r = \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{M} : |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| \leq r\}, \text{ and } \quad \mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{x}}^t = \left\{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{M} : |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^2 \leq 32t\right\}. \tag{C.1}$$

Since the manifold $\mathcal{M}$ is compact, there exists $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{M},\ i = 1, \cdots, N$ such that

$$\mathcal{M} \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^N \mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{x}_i}^r. \tag{C.2}$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathcal{M}} \int_{\mathcal{M}} R\left( \frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{32t} \right) (u(\mathbf{x}) - u(\mathbf{y}))^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \qquad (C.3) \\
\leq\ & \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\mathcal{M}} \int_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{x}_i}^r} R\left( \frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{32t} \right) (u(\mathbf{x}) - u(\mathbf{y}))^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \\
=\ & \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{x}_i}^{2r}} \int_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{x}_i}^r} R\left( \frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{32t} \right) (u(\mathbf{x}) - u(\mathbf{y}))^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the last equality, we use the fact that $R$ is compactly supported and $t$ is small enough. By Proposition 6.1, we have there exist a parametrization $\Phi_i : \Omega_i \subset \mathbb{R}^k \to U_i \subset \mathcal{M}, ; i = 1, \cdots, N$, such that

1. $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{x}_i}^{2r} \subset U_i$ and $\Omega_i$ is convex;
2. $\Phi \in C^3(\Omega)$;
3. For any points $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \Omega$, $\frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| \leq \|\Phi_i(\mathbf{x}) - \Phi_i(\mathbf{y})\| \leq 2|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|$.

For any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{x}_i}^r$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{x}_i}^{2r}$, let

$$\mathbf{z}_j = \Phi\left( \left( \frac{j}{16} \right) \Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{x}) + \left( 1 - \frac{j}{16} \right) \Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{y}) \right), \quad j = 0, \cdots, 16. \tag{C.4}$$

Apparently, $\mathbf{z}_0 = \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_{16} = \mathbf{y}$. Since $\Omega_i$ is convex, we have $\Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{z}_j) \in \Omega_i,\ i = 0, \cdots, 16$. Then utilizing property 3. of $\Phi_i$, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{z}_j - \mathbf{z}_{j+1}\| &\leq 2\|\Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{z}_j) - \Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{z}_{j+1})\| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{8}\|\Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{x}) - \Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{y})\| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{4}\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we are ready to estimate the integrals in (C.3).

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathcal{B}^{2r}_{\mathbf{x}_i}}\int_{\mathcal{B}^{r}_{\mathbf{x}_i}} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{32t}\right)(u(\mathbf{x})-u(\mathbf{y}))^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\mu_{\mathrm{d}}\mathbf{y}\\
\le\ & 16\sum_{j=0}^{15}\int_{\mathcal{B}^{2r}_{\mathbf{x}_i}}\int_{\mathcal{B}^{r}_{\mathbf{x}}} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{32t}\right)(u(\mathbf{z}_j)-u(\mathbf{z}_{j+1}))^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\\
=\ & 16\sum_{j=0}^{15}\int_{\mathcal{B}^{r}_{\mathbf{x}_i}}\left[\int_{\mathcal{M}^t_{\mathbf{x}}} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{32t}\right)(u(\mathbf{z}_j)-u(\mathbf{z}_{j+1}))^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\right]\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}.
\end{aligned}$$

The last equality is due to the fact that the support of $R$ is $[0,1)$. For any $\mathbf{y}\in\mathcal{M}^t_{\mathbf{x}}$,

$$\|\mathbf{z}_j-\mathbf{z}_{j+1}\|^2 \le \frac{1}{16}\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}\|^2 \le 2t, \quad j=0,\cdots,15, \tag{C.5}$$

which implies that

$$R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{z}_j-\mathbf{z}_{j+1}|^2}{4t}\right)\ge \delta_0, \quad j=0,\cdots,15. \tag{C.6}$$

Now, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathcal{B}^{r}_{\mathbf{x}_i}}\left[\int_{\mathcal{M}^t_{\mathbf{x}}} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{32t}\right)(u(\mathbf{z}_j)-u(\mathbf{z}_{j+1}))^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\right]\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\\
=\ &\int_{\mathcal{B}^{r}_{\mathbf{x}_i}}\left[\int_{\mathcal{M}^t_{\mathbf{x}}} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{32t}\right)\left(R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{z}_j-\mathbf{z}_{j+1}|^2}{4t}\right)\right)^{-1} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{z}_j-\mathbf{z}_{j+1}|^2}{4t}\right)(u(\mathbf{z}_j)-u(\mathbf{z}_{j+1}))^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\right]\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\\
\le\ &\frac{1}{\delta_0}\int_{\mathcal{B}^{r}_{\mathbf{x}_i}}\left[\int_{\mathcal{M}^t_{\mathbf{x}}} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{z}_j-\mathbf{z}_{j+1}|^2}{4t}\right)(u(\mathbf{z}_j)-u(\mathbf{z}_{j+1}))^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\right]\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\\
=\ &\frac{1}{\delta_0}\int_{\Phi_i^{-1}(\mathcal{B}^{r}_{\mathbf{x}_i})}\left[\int_{\Phi_i^{-1}(\mathcal{M}^t_{\mathbf{x}})} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{z}_j-\mathbf{z}_{j+1}|^2}{4t}\right)(u(\mathbf{z}_j)-u(\mathbf{z}_{j+1}))^2 \left|\nabla\Phi(\xi_{\mathbf{y}})\right|\mathrm{d}\xi_{\mathbf{y}}\right]\left|\nabla\Phi(\xi_{\mathbf{x}})\right|\mathrm{d}\xi_{\mathbf{x}}\\
\le\ &\frac{4}{\delta_0}\int_{\Phi_i^{-1}(\mathcal{B}^{r}_{\mathbf{x}_i})}\left[\int_{\Phi_i^{-1}(\mathcal{M}^t_{\mathbf{x}})} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{z}_j-\mathbf{z}_{j+1}|^2}{4t}\right)(u(\mathbf{z}_j)-u(\mathbf{z}_{j+1}))^2 \mathrm{d}\xi_{\mathbf{y}}\right]\mathrm{d}\xi_{\mathbf{x}}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\xi_{\mathbf{x}}=\Phi_i^{-1}(\mathbf{x})$, $\xi_{\mathbf{y}}=\Phi_i^{-1}(\mathbf{y})$.

Let

$$\xi_{\mathbf{z}_j}=\Phi_i^{-1}(\mathbf{z}_j)=\frac{j}{16}\xi_{\mathbf{x}}+\left(1-\frac{j}{16}\right)\xi_{\mathbf{y}}, \quad j=0,\cdots,16. \tag{C.7}$$

It is easy to show that $\Phi_i(\xi_{\mathbf{z}_j})=\mathbf{z}_j\in\mathcal{B}^{2r}_{\mathbf{x}_i}$, $j=0,\cdots,16$ by using the facts that for any $\mathbf{y}\in\mathcal{M}^t_{\mathbf{x}}$

$$\|\mathbf{z}_j-\mathbf{x}\|\le\sum_{l=1}^{j}\|\mathbf{z}_l-\mathbf{z}_{l-1}\|\le\frac{j}{4}\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}\|\le 15\sqrt{2t}, \quad j=1,\cdots,15, \tag{C.8}$$

and $\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{B}^{r}_{\mathbf{x}_i}$ and $15\sqrt{2t}\le r$. Then we have

$$\xi_{\mathbf{z}_j}\in\Phi_i^{-1}\left(\mathcal{B}^{2r}_{\mathbf{x}_i}\right), \quad j=0,\cdots,16. \tag{C.9}$$

By changing variable, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Phi_i^{-1}(\mathcal{B}^r_{\mathbf{x}_i})}\left[\int_{\Phi_i^{-1}(\mathcal{M}^t_{\mathbf{x}})} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{z}_j-\mathbf{z}_{j+1}|^2}{4t}\right)(u(\mathbf{z}_j)-u(\mathbf{z}_{j+1}))^2\mathrm{d}\xi_{\mathbf{y}}\right]\mathrm{d}\xi_{\mathbf{x}}\\
\le\ & 8^k\int_{\Phi_i^{-1}(\mathcal{B}^{2r}_{\mathbf{x}_i})}\int_{\Phi_i^{-1}\left(\mathcal{B}^{2r}_{\mathbf{x}_i}\right)} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{z}_j-\mathbf{z}_{j+1}|^2}{4t}\right)(u(\mathbf{z}_j)-u(\mathbf{z}_{j+1}))^2\mathrm{d}\xi_{\mathbf{z}_j}\mathrm{d}\xi_{\mathbf{z}_{j+1}}\\
\le\ & 4\cdot 8^k\int_{\Phi_i^{-1}(\mathcal{B}^{2r}_{\mathbf{x}_i})}\int_{\Phi_i^{-1}\left(\mathcal{B}^{2r}_{\mathbf{x}_i}\right)} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{z}_j-\mathbf{z}_{j+1}|^2}{4t}\right)(u(\mathbf{z}_j)-u(\mathbf{z}_{j+1}))^2\left|\nabla\Phi(\xi_{\mathbf{z}_j})\right|\left|\nabla\Phi(\xi_{\mathbf{z}_{j+1}})\right|\mathrm{d}\xi_{\mathbf{z}_j}\mathrm{d}\xi_{\mathbf{z}_{j+1}}\\
=\ & 4\cdot 8^k\int_{\mathcal{B}^{2r}_{\mathbf{x}_i}}\int_{\mathcal{B}^{2r}_{\mathbf{x}_i}} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{z}_j-\mathbf{z}_{j+1}|^2}{4t}\right)(u(\mathbf{z}_j)-u(\mathbf{z}_{j+1}))^2\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{z}_j}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{z}_{j+1}}\\
\le\ & C\int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{B}^{2r}_{\mathbf{x}_i}} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right)(u(\mathbf{x})-u(\mathbf{y}))^2\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we can prove the lemma as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{32t}\right)(u(\mathbf{x})-u(\mathbf{y}))^2\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\\
\le\ & C\sum_{i=1}^N\int_{\mathcal{B}}\int_{\mathcal{M}^{2r}_{\mathbf{x}_i}} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right)(u(\mathbf{x})-u(\mathbf{y}))^2\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\\
\le\ & CN\int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right)(u(\mathbf{x})-u(\mathbf{y}))^2\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

# D Proof of Theorem 9.1

First, we introduce a smooth function $u$ that approximates $\mathbf{u}$ at the samples $P$.

$$u(\mathbf{x})=\frac{C_t}{w_{t,h}(\mathbf{x})}\sum_{i=1}^n R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}_i|^2}{4t}\right)u_iV_i, \tag{D.1}$$

where $w_{t,h}(\mathbf{x})=C_t\sum_{i=1}^n R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}_i|^2}{4t}\right)V_i$. We have the following lemma about the function $w_{t,h}$.

**Lemma D.1.** *Assume the submanifold $\mathcal{M}$ and $\partial\mathcal{M}$ are $C^2$ smooth and the input data $(P,S,\mathbf{V},\mathbf{A})$ is an $h$-integral approximation of $\mathcal{M}$. For both $t$ and $\frac{h}{t^{1/2}}$ sufficiently small, there exists a constant $C_1, C_2$ and $C$ independent of $t,h,\mathbf{x}$, so that*

$$C_1\le w_{t,h}(\mathbf{x})\le C_2,\ \text{and}\ |\nabla w_{t,h}(\mathbf{x})|\le\frac{C}{t^{1/2}}$$

*Proof.* Since the input data $(P,S,\mathbf{V},\mathbf{A})$ is an $h$-integral approximation of $\mathcal{M}$,

$$\left|w_{t,h}(\mathbf{x})-C_t\int_{\mathcal{M}} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right)\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\right|\le\frac{Ch}{t^{1/2}},$$

which, together with Corollary 6.1, shows the bounds on $w_{t,h}(\mathbf{x})$. Next, we show the bound on the gradient.

$$\begin{aligned}
|\nabla w_{t,h}(\mathbf{x})|^2 &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{d}\left(\frac{\partial w_{t,h}}{\partial x^i}\right)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{d}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} C_t R'\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}_j|^2}{4t}\right)\frac{x^i-p_j^i}{2t}V_j\right)^2 \\
&\leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} C_t R'\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}_j|^2}{4t}\right)\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}_j|^2}{4t^2}V_j\right)\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} C_t R'\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}_j|^2}{4t}\right)V_j\right) \\
&\leq \frac{C}{t}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

*Proof.* of Theorem 9.1

In the definition of $u$ and $w_{t,h}$ in (D.1), replace $t$ with $t' = t/18$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} R_{t'}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\left(u(\mathbf{x})-u(\mathbf{y})\right)^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \\
=& \int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} R_{t'}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\left(\frac{1}{w_{t',h}(\mathbf{x})}\sum_{i=1}^{n} R_{t'}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_i)u_iV_i - \frac{1}{w_{t',h}(\mathbf{y})}\sum_{j=1}^{n} R_{t'}(\mathbf{p}_j,\mathbf{y})u_jV_j\right)^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \\
=& \int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} R_{t'}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\left(\frac{1}{w_{t',h}(\mathbf{x})w_{t',h}(\mathbf{y})}\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} R_{t'}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_i)R_{t'}(\mathbf{p}_j,\mathbf{y})V_iV_j(u_i-u_j)\right)^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \\
\leq& \int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} R_{t'}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\frac{1}{w_{t',h}(\mathbf{x})w_{t',h}(\mathbf{y})}\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} R_{t'}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_i)R_{t'}(\mathbf{p}_j,\mathbf{y})V_iV_j(u_i-u_j)^2\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \\
=& \sum_{i,j=1}^{n}\left(\int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}}\frac{1}{w_{t',h}(\mathbf{x})w_{t',h}(\mathbf{y})}R_{t'}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_i)R_{t'}(\mathbf{p}_j,\mathbf{y})R_{t'}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}\right)V_iV_j(u_i-u_j)^2
\end{aligned}$$

Denote

$$A = \int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}}\frac{1}{w_{t',h}(\mathbf{x})w_{t',h}(\mathbf{y})}R_{t'}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_i)R_{t'}(\mathbf{p}_j,\mathbf{y})R_{t'}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}}$$

and then notice only when $|\mathbf{p}_i-\mathbf{p}_j|^2 \leq 36t'$ is $A \neq 0$. For $|\mathbf{p}_i-\mathbf{p}_j|^2 \leq 36t'$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
A &\leq \int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} R_{t'}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_i)R_{t'}(\mathbf{p}_j,\mathbf{y})R_{t'}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{p}_i-\mathbf{p}_j|^2}{72t'}\right)^{-1}R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{p}_i-\mathbf{p}_j|^2}{72t'}\right)\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \\
&\leq \frac{CC_t}{\delta_0}\int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} R_{t'}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_i)R_{t'}(\mathbf{p}_j,\mathbf{y})R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{p}_i-\mathbf{p}_j|^2}{72t'}\right)\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \\
&\leq CC_t\int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} R_{t'}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_i)R_{t'}(\mathbf{p}_j,\mathbf{y})R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{p}_i-\mathbf{p}_j|^2}{72t'}\right)\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \\
&\leq CC_tR\left(\frac{|\mathbf{p}_i-\mathbf{p}_j|^2}{4t}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two inequalities and Lemma 4.5, we obtain

$$C\frac{C_t}{t}\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{p}_i-\mathbf{p}_j|^2}{4t}\right)(u_i-u_j)^2V_iV_j \geq \int_{\mathcal{M}}(u(\mathbf{x})-\bar{u})^2\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \tag{D.2}$$

We now lower bound the RHS of the above equation using $< \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u} >_{\mathbf{V}}$.

$$|\mathcal{M}||\bar{u}| \;=\; \left|\int_{\mathcal{M}} u(\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\right| = \left|\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left(u_j V_j \int_{\mathcal{M}} \frac{C_t'}{w_{t',h}(\mathbf{x})} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}_j|^2}{4t'}\right)\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}}\right)\right|.$$

Let $q(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{C_t'}{w_{t',h}(\mathbf{x})} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}_j|^2}{4t'}\right)$. There exists a constant $C$ so that $|q(\mathbf{x})| \leq CC_t'$ and

$$|\nabla q(\mathbf{x})| \leq \frac{C_t'}{w_{t',h}(\mathbf{x})}\left|\nabla R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}_j|^2}{4t'}\right)\right| + \frac{C_t'|\nabla w_{t',h}(\mathbf{x})|}{w_{t,h}^2(\mathbf{x})} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}_j|^2}{4t'}\right) \leq \frac{CC_t'}{t^{1/2}}.$$

Then, for sufficiently small $t$, $\frac{h}{t^{1/2}}$, there exists a constant $C$

$$\left|\int_{\mathcal{M}} \frac{C_t'}{w_{t',h}(\mathbf{x})} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}_j|^2}{4t'}\right)\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{C_t'}{w_{t',h}(\mathbf{p}_i)} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{p}_i-\mathbf{p}_j|^2}{4t'}\right) V_i\right| \leq \frac{Ch}{t^{1/2}}.$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\mathcal{M}||\bar{u}| \qquad\qquad (D.3)\\
\leq\;& \left|\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \frac{C_t'}{w_{t',h}(\mathbf{p}_i)} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{p}_i-\mathbf{p}_j|^2}{4t'}\right) u_j V_i V_j\right| + \frac{Ch}{t^{1/2}}(\sum_{j=1}^{n}|u_j V_j|)\\
\leq\;& \left|\sum_{i=1}^{n} u(\mathbf{p}_i)V_i\right| + \frac{Ch}{t^{1/2}}(\sum_{i=1}^{n}|u_i V_i|)\\
=\;& \frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}|}\left|\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \frac{C_t'}{w_{t',h}(\mathbf{p}_i)} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{p}_i-\mathbf{p}_j|^2}{4t'}\right)(u_j-u_i)V_i V_j\right| + \frac{Ch}{t^{1/2}}(\sum_{i=1}^{n} u_i^2 V_i)^{1/2}\\
\leq\;& \frac{CC_t^{1/2}}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{M}|}}\left(\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}_j|^2}{4t'}\right)(u_i-u_j)^2 V_i V_j\right)^{1/2} + \frac{Ch}{t^{1/2}}(\sum_{i=1}^{n} u_i^2 V_i)^{1/2}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality is due to $\sum_{i=1}^{n} u_i V_i = 0$. Denote

$$\begin{aligned}
A = \int_{\mathcal{M}} \frac{C_t}{w_{t',h}^2(\mathbf{x})} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}_i|^2}{4t'}\right) R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}_l|^2}{4t'}\right)\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} -\\
\sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{C_t}{w_{t',h}^2(\mathbf{p}_j)} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{p}_j-\mathbf{p}_i|^2}{4t'}\right) R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{p}_j-\mathbf{p}_l|^2}{4t'}\right) V_j
\end{aligned}$$

and then $|A| \leq \frac{Ch}{t^{1/2}}$. At the same time, notice that only when $|\mathbf{p}_i - \mathbf{p}_l|^2 < 16t'$ is $A \neq 0$. Thus we have

$$|A| \leq \frac{1}{\delta_0}|A| R(\frac{|\mathbf{p}_i-\mathbf{p}_l|^2}{32t'}), \text{ and}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\int_{\mathcal{M}} u^2(\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} - \sum_{j=1}^{n} u^2(\mathbf{p}_j)V_j\right| \qquad (D.4)\\
\leq\;& \sum_{i,l=1}^{n} |C_t u_i u_l V_i V_l||A|\\
\leq\;& \frac{Ch}{t^{1/2}}\sum_{i,l=1}^{n}\left|C_t R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{p}_i-\mathbf{p}_l|^2}{32t'}\right) u_i u_l V_i V_l\right|\\
\leq\;& \frac{Ch}{t^{1/2}}\sum_{i,l=1}^{n} C_t R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{p}_i-\mathbf{p}_l|^2}{32t'}\right) u_i^2 V_i V_l \leq \frac{Ch}{t^{1/2}}\sum_{i=1}^{n} u_i^2 V_i.
\end{aligned}$$

Now combining Equation (D.2), (D.3) and (D.4), we have for small $t$

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^n u^2(\mathbf{p}_i)V_i &= \int_{\mathcal{M}} u^2(\mathbf{x})\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} + \frac{Ch}{t^{1/2}}\sum_{i=1}^n u_i^2 V_i \\ &\leq 2\int_{\mathcal{M}} (u(\mathbf{x})-\bar{u})^2\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} + 2\bar{u}^2|\mathcal{M}| + \frac{Ch}{t^{1/2}}\sum_{i=1}^n u_i^2 V_i \\ &\leq \frac{CC_t}{t}\sum_{i,j=1}^n R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{p}_i-\mathbf{p}_j|^2}{4t}\right)(u_i-u_j)^2 V_i V_j + \frac{Ch}{t}\sum_{i=1}^n u_i^2 V_i.\end{aligned}$$

Here we use the fact that for $t = 18t'$

$$R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{p}_i-\mathbf{p}_j|^2}{4t'}\right) \leq \frac{1}{\delta_0} R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{p}_i-\mathbf{p}_j|^2}{4t}\right).$$

Let $\delta = \frac{w_{\min}}{2w_{\max}+w_{\min}}$. If $\sum_{i=1}^n u^2(\mathbf{p}_i)V_i \geq \delta^2 \sum_{i=1}^n u_i^2 V_i$, then we have completed the proof. Otherwise, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (u_i - u(\mathbf{p}_i))^2 V_i = \sum_{i=1}^n u_i^2 V_i + \sum_{i=1}^n u(\mathbf{p}_i)^2 V_i - 2\sum_{i=1}^n u_i u(\mathbf{p}_i) V_i \geq (1-\delta)^2 \sum_{i=1}^n u_i^2 V_i.$$

This enables us to prove the ellipticity of $\mathcal{L}$ in the case of $\sum_{i=1}^n u^2(\mathbf{p}_i)V_i < \delta^2 \sum_{i=1}^n u_i^2 V_i$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}& C_t \sum_{i,j=1}^n R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{p}_i-\mathbf{p}_j|^2}{4t'}\right)(u_i-u_j)^2 V_i V_j = 2C_t \sum_{i,j=1}^n R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{p}_i-\mathbf{p}_j|^2}{4t'}\right) u_i(u_i-u_j)V_i V_j \\ =\ & 2\sum_{i=1}^n (u_i - u(\mathbf{p}_i))^2 w_{t,h}(\mathbf{p}_i)V_i + 2\sum_{i=1}^n u(\mathbf{p}_i)(u_i-u(\mathbf{p}_i))w_{t,h}(\mathbf{p}_i)V_i \\ \geq\ & 2\sum_{i=1}^n (u_i - u(\mathbf{p}_i))^2 w_{t,h}(\mathbf{p}_i)V_i - 2\left(\sum_{i=1}^n u^2(\mathbf{p}_i)w_{t,h}(\mathbf{p}_i)V_i\right)^{1/2}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n (u_i-u(\mathbf{p}_i))^2 w_{t,h}(\mathbf{p}_i)V_i\right)^{1/2} \\ \geq\ & 2w_{\min}\sum_{i=1}^n (u_i-u(\mathbf{p}_i))^2 V_i - 2w_{\max}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n u^2(\mathbf{p}_i)V_i\right)^{1/2}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n (u_i-u(\mathbf{p}_i))^2 V_i\right)^{1/2} \\ \geq\ & 2(w_{\min}(1-\delta)^2 - w_{\max}\delta(1-\delta))\sum_{i=1}^n u_i^2 V_i \geq w_{\min}(1-\delta)^2 \sum_{i=1}^n u_i^2 V_i.\end{aligned}$$

□

# E Estimation of $\|\nabla L_t(u_t - u_{t,h})\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})}$

Next, we turn to upper bound $\nabla L_t(u_t - u_{t,h})\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})}$. Consider the first term $\|\nabla(L_t a_{t,h} - L_{t,h}a_{t,h})\|_{L_2}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathcal{M}} |\nabla a_{t,h}(\mathbf{x})|^2 \left| \int_{\mathcal{M}} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} - \sum_{\mathbf{p}_j \in P} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j) V_j \right|^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \qquad \text{(E.1)} \\
\leq\ & \frac{Ch^2}{t} \int_{\mathcal{M}} |\nabla a_{t,h}(\mathbf{x})|^2 \, \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \\
\leq\ & \frac{Ch^2}{t} \left( \int_{\mathcal{M}} \left| \frac{1}{w_{t,h}(\mathbf{x})} \sum_{\mathbf{p}_j \in P} \nabla R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j) u_j V_j \right|^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \right. \\
& \left. + \int_{\mathcal{M}} \left| \frac{\nabla w_{t,h}(\mathbf{x})}{w_{t,h}^2(\mathbf{x})} \sum_{\mathbf{p}_j \in P} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j) u_j V_j \right|^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \right) \\
\leq\ & \frac{Ch^2}{t^2} \int_{\mathcal{M}} \left| \sum_{\mathbf{p}_j \in P} R_{2t}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j) u_j V_j \right|^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \\
\leq\ & \frac{Ch^2}{t^2} \left( \sum_{j=1}^n u_j^2 V_j \int_{\mathcal{M}} R_{2t}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \right) \leq \frac{Ch^2}{t^2} \sum_{j=1}^n u_j^2 V_j.
\end{aligned}$$

where $R_{2t}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j) = C_t R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}_j|^2}{8t}\right)$. Here we use the assumption that $R(s) > \delta_0$ for all $0 \leq s \leq 1/2$.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathcal{M}} |a_{t,h}(\mathbf{x})|^2 \left| \int_{\mathcal{M}} \nabla R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} - \sum_{\mathbf{p}_j \in P} \nabla R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j) V_j \right|^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \qquad \text{(E.2)} \\
\leq\ & \frac{Ch^2}{t^2} \int_{\mathcal{M}} |a_{t,h}(\mathbf{x})|^2 \, \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \leq \frac{Ch^2}{t^2} \sum_{j=1}^n u_j^2 V_j.
\end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned}
B\ =\ & C_t \int_{\mathcal{M}} \frac{1}{w_{t,h}(\mathbf{y})} \nabla R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right) R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{p}_i-\mathbf{y}|^2}{4t}\right) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} \\
-\ & C_t \sum_{\mathbf{p}_j \in P} \frac{1}{w_{t,h}(\mathbf{p}_j)} \nabla R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}_j|^2}{4t}\right) R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{p}_i-\mathbf{p}_j|^2}{4t}\right) V_j.
\end{aligned}$$

We have $|B| < \frac{Ch}{t^{1/2}}$ for some constant $C$ independent of $t$. In addition, notice that only when $|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}_i|^2 \leq 16t$ is $B \neq 0$, which implies

$$|B| \leq \frac{1}{\delta_0} |B| R\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}_i|^2}{32t}\right).$$

Then we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}} \left| \int_{\mathcal{M}} \nabla R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) a_{t,h}(\mathbf{y}) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} - \sum_{\mathbf{p}_j \in P} \nabla R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j) a_{t,h}(\mathbf{p}_j) V_j \right|^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \tag{E.3}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} C_t u_i V_i B \right)^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \\
&\leq \frac{Ch^2}{t^2} \int_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} C_t |u_i| V_i R\left( \frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}_i|^2}{32t} \right) \right)^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \\
&\leq \frac{Ch^2}{t^2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} u_i^2 V_i \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining Equation (E.1), (E.2) and (E.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\nabla(L_t a_{t,h} - L_{t,h} a_{t,h})\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \\
&= \left( \int_M \left| \left(L_t(a_{t,h}) - L_{t,h}(a_{t,h})\right)(\mathbf{x}) \right|^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{t} \left( \int_{\mathcal{M}} \left(\nabla a_{t,h}(\mathbf{x})\right)^2 \left| \int_{\mathcal{M}} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} - \sum_{\mathbf{p}_j \in P} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j) V_j \right|^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \right)^{1/2} \\
&\quad \frac{1}{t} \left( \int_{\mathcal{M}} \left(a_{t,h}(\mathbf{x})\right)^2 \left| \int_{\mathcal{M}} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} - \sum_{\mathbf{p}_j \in P} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j) V_j \right|^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \right)^{1/2} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{t} \left( \int_{\mathcal{M}} \left| \int_{\mathcal{M}} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) a_{t,h}(\mathbf{y}) \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{y}} - \sum_{\mathbf{p}_j \in P} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} R_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j) a_{t,h}(\mathbf{p}_j) V_j \right|^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq \frac{Ch}{t^2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} u_i^2 V_i \right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{Ch}{t^2} \|f\|_\infty
\end{aligned}$$

Using a similar argument, we obtain

$$\|\nabla(L_t c_{t,h} - L_{t,h} c_{t,h})\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \leq \frac{Ch}{t^{3/2}} \|f\|_\infty,$$

and thus

$$\|\nabla(L_t u_{t,h} - L_{t,h} u_{t,h})\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \leq \frac{Ch}{t^2} \|f\|_\infty.$$

At last, we complete the proof using the following fact,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\nabla\left(L_t(u_t) - L_{t,h}(u_{t,h})\right)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \\
&= \left( \int_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \int_{\mathcal{M}} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) f(\mathbf{y}) - \sum_{\mathbf{p}_j \in P} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \bar{R}_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_j) f(\mathbf{p}_j) V_j \right)^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq \frac{Ch}{t} \|f\|_{C^1(\mathcal{M})}.
\end{aligned}$$